VOLUME 55. NOVEMBER 1927. NUMBER 6.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Martin Luther's Contribution to Theology, H. E. Koenig.....401
Philosophy and Education, Dr. J. Evjen 417
Die Kirche und das neue Leben. Dr. Grützmacher..... 425
Die Religion Jesu. Dr. Baur..... 440
Editorials 448
Christian World 454
Book Review 468

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 55. ST. LOUIS, MO. NOVEMBER 1927.

MARTIN LUTHER'S CONTRIBUTION TO THEOLOGY

By H. E. Koenig

(Note: This paper is an abridged presentation of a far more extensive thesis on the same subject. Here are omitted the introduction and sections one, two and four, entitled, respectively: "Why Luther Made His Contribution," "The Development of Luther's Personal Faith Life" and "A Brief Summary of Roman Catholic Doctrine." Although these are not wholly germane to the subject of our paper, the conclusions arrived at in the last section, setting forth Luther's permanent contribution, are partly based on the above-mentioned subdivisions, and therefore the writer thought it necessary to make mention of their omission.)

After having been advanced to the full rights of professor at the newly founded university at Wittenberg, Luther, who taught theology, chose as his subject the *Bible*. To it he adhered exclusively in his lectures. In it he found a new theology.

In the system of sacraments and personal endeavor to which Luther had subjected himself in the monastery, he had failed to find peace at heart. Gradually, however, his study of the Scriptures revealed unto him the "merciful God" in the incarnate and risen Christ. Harnack finds in this experience of the great man a close parallel to Paul's conversion, excepting that Luther's was not so sudden or violent. More and more the conviction had grown upon him that faith, and faith alone makes possible a real communion with God.

The primary question around which everything else centered always remained this, how he, a sinful man, could possibly stand before God and obtain salvation. Involved in this was the question concerning the righteousness of God. Now he was no longer terrified by the avenging justice of God, but he recognized the meaning

of that righteousness declared in the New Testament (Romans 1: 17, 3: 25) by which the merciful God justifies the faithful, "in that He of His Own grace establishes them in His sight and effects an inward change, and lets them thenceforth, like children, enjoy His fatherly love and blessing.[1]

Upon the basis of this fundamental principle Luther waged his battles against Roman Catholicism. He compared his simple experience with the complicated system his church offered as religion, and proceeded to reduce and simplify the current Christian theology. "This reduction,' says Harnack, "was no less than the reestablishment of the religion which seeks and finds God."[2]

A SUMMARIZED CHARACTERIZATION

For Luther the Christian religion is a living trust in a living God who has revealed Himself and opened His heart in Jesus Christ,—nothing else. *Objectively,* it is Christ, His person and work; *subjectively,* faith; its *content,* the merciful God, and therefore forgiveness of sins, which includes sonship and salvation. (Brief summary of Harnack's characterization of Luther's theology.)

FAITH

The Character of Faith

For scholasticism it was sufficient that faith be the intellectual assent to the dogma that the Scriptures are inspired and therefore authoritative and binding. To know their content is not necessary, such knowledge being demanded only for the symbols of faith as promulgated by the church upon the basis of Scripture and tradition. This faith, the scholastics taught, is infused by God. It can and often does lead to love of God. On the other hand this God-infused faith can be void of hope, in which case it leads to servile fear.

For Luther faith and fear *always* exclude each other. For him faith is invariably characterized by hope and trust. He teaches that faith always gives birth to joy and love of life (Lebenstrieb), whereas he compares historical faith, which is not necessarily based on personal experience, to scum on water.

Such faith that lacks the element of confidence and trust, which does not *renew* the heart, Luther condemns as the product of man, a self-fabricated, uncertain opinion, intrinsically false, because it is without a personally experienced appreciation of God's love for man. It leads to presumption and finally to despair. It cannot prepare for grace and must therefore be rejected as harmful. He characterizes such whose faith is limited to intellectual assent

[1] Koestlin p. 68.
[2] Harnack H. D, 3: 824.

with the following words: "There are some who hear and read the Gospel and what it says of faith, who term as faith something which it is in their power to have or not to have, as a natural human work. As they consequently see and feel that there is no change (in their rel. life) they cry—'faith is of no avail.' What are such thoughts which they call faith other than a dream, a nightmare (Nachtgebilde) which they have themselves placed into their hearts without God. Such will only become still worse than they are."[3]

(Note: Wherever quotations in this paper are based on the Erlangen edition the translations were made by the writer.)

The Base and Source of Faith

Luther accepted the Roman Catholic doctrine of original sin which teaches that man is by nature evil and corrupt. Saving faith cannot, therefore, enter into his experience as the product of any attributes of character inherent in human personality, but must be received as a *gift* from God. Man's faith is a self-affirmation of God's grace in the believer. This truth the individual apprehends clearly only as the content and the quality of this faith is understood and experienced by him. A priori conceptions cannot give man certainty of faith nor reveal its true nature. Luther teaches: "If I perceive that Christ has saved me with his whole life—I understand that that is God's will, and thus I climb through Christ to the Father. Thus my confidence to Him grows, that I know Him as my dear Father. I must *experience* (fuehlen) the great kindness (Wohltat) of Christ. Thereupon my trust in God and love for Him grow—and that must be *felt.*"

These experiences are mediated to man through God's Word, which appeals to him as a word spoken by God Himself. Again I quote: "Faith in God clings to the Word, not because of what is said but because the heart feels its truth with such certainty that nothing can tear it away. . . . The Word must *satisfy* the heart, in close and captivate man so that he is, as it were, held prisoner within it, and experience how true and right it is, even though all the world, yet God Himself say otherwise."[5]

The ethical implications of faith, as Luther saw it, are aptly set forth in the following quotations: "Faith is a divine work in us which transforms and makes us reborn of God; it kills the old Adam, makes of us totally different people and brings with it the Holy Spirit. O, it is a living, busy, active, powerful force, so that it is impossible for it not to engage in unceasing good. Faith does not ask whether good works are to be done, but before asking it has preformed them and is constantly doing. Whosoever fails to do

[3] 2nd Erl. ed. 13: 301.
[4] 2nd Erl. ed. 10: 162.
[5] 2nd Erl. ed. 10: 162.

such works is a man without faith. To separate works from faith is as impossible as to separate burning and glowing from fire."[6] And again, "even as fire cannot be without heat and smoke, so faith cannot be without love."

REVELATION

In the reformer's doctrine of revelation we shall consider how, according to Luther, God establishes that personal relationship between Himself and the individual, which makes it possible for the Father to call forth within the heart of His children the experience of saving faith.

In order to enter into a conscious, living, vital relationship with any personality man must at least have knowledge of his existence. How can man know God? How does God reveal self to man?

In Romans 1: 19-20 Paul refers to God's revelation of self through the phenomena of nature. Apparently the apostle is of the opinion that what man can learn about God through his study of nature ought to be sufficient to bring him in humble obedience to the eternal laws of the Almighty. For Luther, however, all knowledge based merely upon logical deduction has but little value, he terms it "left-handed"[7] knowledge. *Nature discloses nothing of God's heart.* For Luther this is essential. At its best, *reason* can know God only as law-giver, judge and executive. Its revelation is therefore but partly true and leads to despair. Because of this it is clearly a mistaken notion that man can come to God by his own efforts.

The law written upon the heart of man can at best offer but a point of contact from which the higher revelation, as given in God's Word can proceed to effect a satisfactory relationship between God and man. Luther remarks: "Because it (the natural law) is in the heart, although but dark and faded, it is again brought to life through the Word, so that the heart must admit that what the commandments state is true, namely, that one must honor and serve God, since He alone is good and does good. Yes, man cannot succeed without the light of the Holy Spirit."[8] Other quotations are: "one must write and preach (the law) until *God* work along with man (mitwirken) and enlighten them, that they feel it in their heart to be true as it is put in the Word."[9] Also the well known catechism statement: "I believe that I cannot by my own strength and reason etc."

---

[6] Idem 63: 124.
[7] Erl. ed. 48: 87.
[8] Erl. ed. 36: 57.
[9] Idem. 29: 156.

True knowledge of God is for Luther, in its practical implications, identical with the faith that saves. This can come to man only through the Gospel, as indicated above, or, to be more specific, through the contemplation of Christ as man. Luther finds the humanity of Christ to be the specific vehicle of God's revelation of self, "tum prorsus nullum Deum scito extra istum hominem Jesum Christum."[10]

As man learns to comprehend the true nature of God as revealed through the historical Christ, He becomes so attractive that the thought of God's omnipotence is no longer unbearable but becomes a source of comfort. "If I now have the Father's heart (Christ), I have with Him all divine omnipotence and power."[11]

It is not necessary to presuppose Christ's divinity before acknowledging His humanity. The man who seeks Jesus must: "Seek Him as He walked upon earth, there he will find that He came for our life, light and salvation. Thereupon (having contemplated Christ's life and passion) I climb higher through the Son to the Father and behold that *Christ is God.*"[12]

Christ is the norm, the criterion, the principle which must guide and control man as he seeks to interpret the Bible. "All Scripture is to be related to Christ or to be understood in relationship to Christ, otherwise we shall not accept it as true Scripture."[13] ". . . . for He is the center (Punkt) of the circle, from which the whole circle is drawn."[14]

In discounting the importance of the Reformation for the modern age, many historians of today point out that although the reformers must be credited with having overthrown the arbitrary, often tyrannical authority of the pope, they soon dissipated the good thus accomplished by formulating the doctrine of verbal inspiration, which elevated a book to the throne denied the "holy father." Be that as it may, Luther cannot be accused of this, since, although he unhesitatingly accepted the authority of the Bible, he graded the various books of the Scriptures as to their worth. "Luther asserts that the epistles of Paul and Peter are far superior to the Gospel of Matthew, Mark and Luke. As his smaller New Testament he selected the Gospel of John, the First Epistle of John, Paul's letters, especially Romans, Galatians, Ephesians and First Peter. When compared with these James is a 'right strawy epistle.' His second New Testament consisted of the synoptic Gospels, Acts, and the rest of the Pauline letters, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John.

[10] Volume on Gal. Erl. ed. p. 49.
[11] Erl. ed. 50: 180.
[12] 2nd Erl. ed. 12: 249.
[13] Opera Varii Argumenta, Erl. ed. 4: 381.
[14] Erl. ed. 46: 348.

His third New Testament was composed of James, Hebrews, Jude, Revelation of John. Evidently Luther regarded the Bible as containing the Word of God. His theory of inspiration was stated in this manner, 'the prophets were holy, spiritual, industrial folks who earnestly reflected upon divine and holy things. Hence God spoke to their consciences. This the prophets interpreted as revelation."[15]

CHRIST

Since Augustine the doctrine was generally accepted that Christ as the divine-human head of the church had, through his innocent suffering and death, made satisfaction to the righteous God for the sins of all its members. This satisfaction served to conciliate a justly angry God and made possible man's redemption.

This doctrine of the mother church Luther accepted although it is not in absolute logical conformity with his contention that man is saved by faith. According to the fundamental principle of the Reformation man's relationship to God does not rest upon a legal foundation. Only through the heart-transforming power of freely forgiving love is the eternal content of the law realized and made effective and a harmonious and satisfying union between God and man established.

It is refreshing to note that whenever the reformer discusses the atoning death of Christ the coldly calculating legal aspect which dominated Augustine's dogma, recedes completely into the background before the warm glow of genuine love for the Saviour which tinged Luther's presentation. A few characteristic illustrations will show this. "As if He (Christ) were to say 'behold, man, I tell thee and give thee with these words (in the Lord's supper) forgiveness of sins and life eternal. And that thou mayest be certain and know that such promise is irrevocable, I will therefore give my life and blood for it, and will leave them unto thee as a sign and symbol."[16]

"Wilt thou not constrain thyself no longer to behold the suffering of Christ but seek to penetrate through it and behold his compassionate (freundlich) and gentle heart, filled with love for thee which compels Him, that He thus carries the burden of the conscience and sin? Thus thy heart will become sweet and your trust in Him strengthened."[17] He interprets Christ as saying: "when you behold this (suffering) then understand that I speak to you of the Father's love, grace and compassion and prove it with my deed, since I die for you and shall rise again."[18]

---

[15] Moehlmann, The Unknown Bible, 124 and 125.
[16] Erl. ed. 27: 147.
[17] 2nd Erl. ed. 11: 161.
[18] Erl. ed. 49: 183.

GOD

Luther rejects all metaphysical speculation about God's being, recognizing only the strictly religious attitude toward Him. He believes that in seeking to comprehend the Almighty man should learn to know Him in His relationship to mankind rather than seek to understand His nature.

"To have God is nothing else than to trust and believe in Him from the heart, to call upon Him in trouble, to pray to Him and to serve Him. A god, if he were a god for himself alone in heaven, would be a god of stone or straw.[19]

By revealing His right relationship to man, as comprehended by faith in Jesus Christ, God discloses Himself to the earnest seeker as the correlate to the faith or trust which flees to Him for refuge. The rather terrifying conception of God as unlimited power becomes to man a source of comfort as he learns to trust in Him through faith in Jesus Christ.

We have already called attention to the fact that the Middle Ages taught that God's righteousness brings man into a legal relationship with deity. This doctrine Luther rejects absolutely. To acquire any merit is impossible for man, the hope to be able to do so is a false dream. "All who seek to buy God's grace through many good works as though He were a merchant or employer, are false prophets, who do not believe that God gave His grace freely and for nothing."[20]

"The faith which knows itself directly dependent upon God, honors Him."[21]

Luther admits that God punishes man, but only because He loves him, seeking thereby to subdue evil. "Nevertheless He remains pure love, as His nature is wholly love, even though He thunders and must punish. It all happens because of pure love and out of a good heart."[22] "He separates man from his evil habits (Laster), thinking only of destroying evil that he may preserve man."[23]

SIN

Luther's doctrine of sin is closely allied with his doctrine of God. He teaches: "Impietas, asebia, in Hebrew resa, is really the sin that one fails to honor God, i. e., that one does not believe, trust, fear or give self over to Him, does not permit Him to reign or to be God."[24]

---

[19] 2nd Erl. ed. 6: 103.
[20] 2nd Erl. ed. 18: 316.
[21] 2nd Erl. ed. 18: 316.
[22] Idem. 15: 140.
[23] Erl. ed. 27: 53.
[24] 2nd Erl. ed. 7: 138.

The natural, inborn, inherited inclination of the heart toward evil is for Luther the source of all sinful desire, words and deeds. "Original sin is nothing else than the inclination toward evil, such as pride, anger, envy, unchastity, which all men experience."[25] "Original sin is the sin of nature,—Personsuende—, the major sin. . . . It is not committed, as all other sins, but it is, it lives and does all sin and is the essence of sin. It does not sin for an hour or for a time, but wherever man is and as long as a person is there is this sin also."[26] "Especially does the Holy Scripture consider the heart the root and principle source of all sin, which is unbelief of the heart."[27]

Unbelief asserts itself in ceaseless activity of sinning, primarily against the first four commandments, especially the first. It gives birth to pride, doubt, grumbling against God, sins, which, though scholasticism largely ignores them, are for Luther the most grievous. Because of his unbelief man also finds it impossible to fulfill the demands of the last six commandments, which enjoin upon him the duty to love his neighbor as himself. He who lacks faith, clings to material possessions; he also fears the evils and hardships of this world.

"Where there is unbelief, man falls upon them (material possessions), clings to them, seeks them until he succeed in his quest, and then wallows about in them as a sow in dirt and finds his salvation in them—his belly is his god."[28] "The godless may refrain from doing evil but they avoid it merely in order that they may not be disgraced or to escape the torments of hell, yet they are full of evil desires in their heart, they seek honor and power."[29] "Who feels God's kindness also feels his neighbors misfortune; he who does not experience God's benevolence (Wohlwollen) hardens his heart against his neighbor."[30]

REDEMPTION

Scholasticism and later Protestantism teach that Christ reconciled God, and in this way made possible the redemption of the individual. Luther's conception goes deeper than that. For him redemption includes a subjective process in man.—Through the law God creates adequate fear to perturb the conscience and effect contrition. He who through Christ enters into a positive relationship to God (which the law demands but sin disturbs), is redeemed. He is freed from the mandatory and condemning implications of the law and now gladly and freely obeys its contents.

[25] Idem. 15: 29.
[26] Idem. 10: 322.
[27] Erl. ed. 63: 123.
[28] 2nd Erl. ed. 13: 5.
[29] Idem. 7: 41.
[30] Idem. 13: 6.

"Behold, thus Christ has in a spiritual sense redeemed us from the law; not that the law is abrogated, but our heart, which formerly was subject to it but unwillingly, is so changed, so much good is accorded it and the law made so attractive that the heart now finds no greater joy than in the law."[31]

Forgiveness of sins is more than release from guilt, it receives man into benevolent favor with God, guarantees daily forgiveness of sins which are committed even after faith has established a normal, wholesome, vital relationship to God; it results in a state of blessedness.

The direct historical product of man's redemption was the creation of a communion of the redeemed. Luther often compares the relationship of Christ to the company of the saved to a marriage. For him the essential characteristic of the church was a simple, natural association of those who knew themselves to be redeemed. This conception is in strong contrast to Roman Catholicism which insists that the true church can be erected only upon the foundation of the hierarchy.

ETERNAL LIFE

In his conception of salvation Luther set himself in opposition to the then current popular opinion that the state of blessedness is unlimited bliss in heaven. It was Augustine who had prepared the way for Luther's doctrine with his statement, "for me the 'good' is to cling to God."

Upon the basis of such passages as are found John 17: 3 and 6: 47 Luther emphasizes that salvation or 'eternal life' is accorded man through faith. This *life* begins here, grows continuously and is developed in the hereafter in intensity, atlhough its *essence is never changed.*

"It must truly begin here and be recognized and embraced by faith, what there we shall inherit and possess forever."[32] "If you believe, then you are saved and eternal life has been granted unto you."—"If I do not receive it here I shall never overtake it there; but rather here, in this body, must it be apprehended."[33]

Luther distinguishes between God's favor, which receives man, and His gift, which is a state of being, in which the changed relationship to God is sustained and developed. "Even though we have not yet reached perfection, so that God's gift and His spirit must daily grow in us—yet His grace deems us to be perfectly righteous before Him. For His grace is not divided or broken in parts, but it receives man completely into His favor, for Christ's sake, who is

[31] Idem. 7: 302.
[32] Erl. ed. 50: 177.
[33] Erl. ed. 50: 177.

our advocate, and because His gift has begun to work in us."[34] "Grace forgives sin, creates peace of heart and places man into the Kingdom of God's mercy—the *gift* is, however, that the Holy Spirit creates in man new thoughts, attitudes, a new heart, comfort, strength and life."[35] "Where God is served, there is heaven. If I serve my neighbor, I am already in heaven, for I serve God."[36]

Gottschick summarizes: "For Luther the state of blessedness is the joyous certainty which God grants and man experiences in its beginnings in the present life. It permeates the whole of man as an active, virile leaven with love for God and trust in His divine providence. Such a child of God is constrained to give self over confidently to God's love and guidance, and gladly obeys the demand that he love his neighbor as himself."[37]

The same authority also observes: "Later Protestant theology failed to retain Luther's conception of eternal life. It taught that fulfilment of the law is the condition upon which it is granted, whereas Luther finds it to be God's gift to man, which constrains man to adopt ever more fully the essential content of the law as an integral part of his personality. This decided change of Luther's doctrine was fraught with grave consequences for Protestant theology"[38]

NOTE: Here the writer omits Section VI of the original thesis, entitled: The Elements of Roman Catholic Doctrine which Luther Rejected.

LUTHER'S INFLUENCE ON PROTESTANT DOGMA

Luther was an original thinker but not a systematizer. Harnackobserves: "Luther never felt a strong desire to work out a systematic presentation of those religious conceptions which he evolved from his personal experience. He never felt the urge to point out which elements of the old doctrine he rejected and which he retained. He labored in the field of theology as a child plays in a home, bringing forth old and new, always being concerned only with its immediate practical importance. The correction of theoretical errors concerned him but little. He had no desire to work out an ordered body of doctrine. But his strength (his refreshing originality and brave pioneering) was also the source of his greatest weakness."

Consequently Luther left many problems unsolved. He also retained and often defended old Catholic dogmas which really were not in harmony with his fundamental position. His usual policy

[34] Introduction to Romans 63: 124.
[35] Erl. ed. 12: 313.
[36] Idem. 13: 68.
[37] Gottschick: Luther's Theologie. Page 36.
[38] Idem. page 36.

was to ignore what was irrelevant. For instance, the Greek speculations woven so intricately into the old Catholic dogma Luther accepted as a matter of course. Its history of development was not known at the time so it was generally received as based upon Scripture.

The nearest approach Luther made to a systematic presentation of his doctrine is to be found in his catechisms and the Augsburg Confession. The latter, although written by Melanchthon, was based on Luther's Torgauer Articles. The great reformer indorsed the Confession without reservations. We must not overlook in this connection, however, that the Augustana was written as an apology and seeks to meet Roman Catholicism as far as possible.

The great mass of Luther's followers accepted him as their master in theology, an authority whom they merely interpreted. The great conglomerate of dogma which Luther had championed or failed to assail they sought to systematize and interpret without in any way learning from their great hero how to be bravely original and wholesomely progressive. Lutheran theologians lost themselves ever more deeply in the morass of trivial, narrow, scholastic speculation. Their dogma became barren, intolerant, unfruitful, altogether foreign in spirit to that of its great founder.

LUTHER'S PERMANENT CONTRIBUTION

"Historical study of the growth of any human ideas always tends to liberate man from subjection to those ideas," thus, wisely, remarks Wilhelm Herrmann. The historical method of inquiry seeks to study and evaluate human achievements in their relationship to the period in which they were produced. Adoption of this method has caused leading theologians, even in Lutheran circles, to adopt an attitude to the reformer's theology which is quite different from the abject devotion accorded it in a former period which indorsed the popular slogan: "Gottes Wort und Luther's Lehr, vergehen nun und nimmermehr." That bordered perilously close on the verge of being idolatry. Its hero would have been the first to condemn it. A noted authority assures us: "Luther never demands submission to prescribed doctrine as an essential part of religious experience. Instead of holding such submission to be a means of salvation, he pronounced it sin."

Nevertheless it is manifestly evident that the profound religious experience upon which Luther based his theology impregnated it with principles of religion which are permanently valuable.

Permanent Principles of Religion

I believe that the most valuable and significant permanent contribution Martin Luther bequeathed to posterity is to be found

in the inspiring challenge which his dynamic personality brings to all who come under the sway of his influence, to place *persistent, humble sincerity* first in their quest for the living God.

This assertion may be challenged on the ground that others were equally as sincere as Luther, that their example is no less inspiring. Yet, as we call to mind the unique, unparalleled importance which must be attached to the personality and activity of Luther in the history of Christianity, we realize that for centuries to come more students will focus their attention upon the study of this remarkable man than on others equally as worthy, but less conspicuous.

Another permanent contribution to the religious life and experience of mankind with which we can credit Luther is the decided emphasis he placed upon the principle that true religion must be a matter of the heart, a positive conviction based upon personal experience. Luther was absolutely certain that he had found a "merciful God." He successfully challenged the assertion of the church that it alone could mediate between God and man. The result was that a large number of God's children who had hitherto dared to approach God only through the priesehood, now were free to establish a personal relationship with their Father in heaven.

In fighting his way through to the positive conviction of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, Luther had subjected himself to the influence of all the religious rites, ceremonies and customs known and practised by the church of his day. He also explored the great mass of religious literature which the past had produced. The conviction at which he finally arrived was therefore colored and largely determined by his environment, which fact alone made it possible for him to exert a potent influence upon his generation. Still, in the last analysis, Luther's position was peculiarly his own, which made it possible for him to champion it successfully. By adopting this policy Luther gave to posterity another valuable example which ought to be of special significance for our present generation to which the task of reconstructing anew the system of Christian theology, so that it may meet the requirements of the new day has been entrusted.

In this connection we can also most opportunely call attention to the fact that whenever his personal conviction in matters of doctrine ran counter to the dogma of the Church, Luther would refuse to bow to its tyrannical claim to absolute authority and infallibility. Yet, he did not base his theology upon the unstable foundation of personal caprice but established it upon a trustworthy objective reality. "With Luther the person of Jesus stands in the very center of the religious experience itself. Jesus makes him

certain of God, lets him see the divine nature and life, and becomes to him that manifstation of God's grace in which God enters into communion with him, He *knows* that he has been lifted up to God, and he traces the power of Jesus in that fact."[39]

The above is probably the primary contribution made by Luther. It is very unfortunate that for nearly 400 years the disciples of this great man ignored this fact. Misinterpreting the true spirit of his genius, they retained and emphasized the old Catholic doctrine as most important. This, it is true, Luther had accepted and defended, because he interpreted its conclusions back into Scriptures. But in his religious life it failed to exert any influence, nor did it effect him in the daily practice of his faith-life. It was the spirit of Christ which had captivated and then controlled Luther. Abstruse and subtle speculations were abhorrent to him, since he clearly saw they had no religious value. "The sign is all that they deal with; but they do not teach *faith* even in this, but their own preparations, opera operata, participations and fruits of the mass. At length they have reached the very depth of error, and have involved themselves in an infinity of metaphysical triflings."[40] Still, the master was at times himself guilty of the mistake he here condemns. Yet we have no doubt but that, even though he thereby set an example which, alas, too many of his admirers have followed to this very day, this will be felt only as a passing phase in the influence of this truly great man. And, after all, what are 400 years in the history of the Christian community! We firmly believe that Luther will exert a greater influence in the new day than in the past; greater, because more vital, more vital, because, being rid in the course of time of its dead weight, his theology will be destined to exert a more effective and wholesome influence upon essentials in the realm of religion.

The positive, constructive attitude toward life adopted and followed by Luther, after once having established his religious life upon a satisfactory basis, is another permanent contribution of real significance. For Protestantism he definitely sloughed off the world-fleeing, world-despising ideal of asceticism. Faith in Jesus Christ so vitalized, guided and controlled the life of Luther that fear and the monastic ideal became totally foreign to him. He was positive that human existence had intrinsic and permanent value, that it is man's duty to love and serve his fellowman, that God through Christ loves man. In the strength of this faith Luther went forward bravely, confidently, joyfully and serenely projecting self from day to day toward a better tomorrow.

---

[39] Herrmann, Communion with God, page 170.
[40] From L's "Babylonian Captivity"—Wace and Buchheim, page 170.

It is true that in the declining years of his life Luther apparently lost much of the spirit of daring and aggressive pioneering in the realm of religion, which characterized the early period of his activity, especially the years from 1517 to 1523. It cannot be denied that, rather than trust unreservedly in the overruling providence of the Almighty, he compromised with temporal rulers in order to make sure the permanency of the movement he had called into life. At times he waxed sullen or became unreasonably stubborn. Psychologists can probably readily explain this phenomena. Yet the appreciative student of his life will through and under all his human frailties discern a calm, certain, positive, quiet spirit of peace, born in the heart of God, which may be compared to the waters in the deep places of the sea, which remain undisturbed, even though the fury of the storm may lash the surface waters most furiously. "But whether we turn to his discourse of the year 1518 on Repentance, or to the sermons of the last years of his life, we find everywhere the same portrayal of the new life awakened in him by God, in the strength of which he could say of himself 'my spirit is too glad and too great for me to be at heart an enemy to any man."[41], [42]

PERMANENT VALUES IN LUTHER'S DOCTRINE

Faith

Through faith in Jesus Christ Luther embraced God as Father. The compelling force of this faith, championed and extolled by the great man, will *always* be the most profound, vital and satisfactory experience with which any of God's children may be blessed.

Revelation

If the above statment is true, then the Bible will always be the most important vehicle of God's revelation to man, because it contains the Gospel of Jesus Christ, through whom God set forth the true nature of His divine personality.

God

Luther sought primarily to comprehend God in His relationship to sinful man. That is a permanently valuable principle. He was right when he discounted the alleged transcendent importance of metaphysical speculations concerning the deity, in which the scholastics simply revelled. These are valuable only in so far as they help the philosopher to gain a clear conception of the unsatisfactory theories concerning divinity, such as pantheism, polytheism, deism and materialism, which have formed the content of various philosophic speculations. These can now be definitely discarded,

[41] Erl. ed. 24: 16.
[42] W. Herrmann, Communion with God, page 56.

because inadequate. To believe in God as a personal Being who has established a vital communion with His children, that is important, even though man cannot penetrate into the essence of His nature. This God Luther found through the historical Christ. "When I thus imagine Christ, then I picture Him truly and properly, I grasp and have the true Christ as He pictures Himself; and then I let go utterly all thoughts and speculations concerning the divine majesty and glory and hang and cling to the humanity of Christ: then there is no fear there, but only friendliness and joy, and I learn thus through Him to know the Father. Thus arises such a light and knowledge within me that I know certainly what God is, and what is His mind."[43]

CHRIST

Luther also discouraged subtle speculations concerning the divine-human nature of Christ. He writes: "As for the man who will not adhere to the Word, but who seeks to be subtle and reason how it can sound correct that God and man are one person, let him go and be subtle and speculate, and see what he gains by it. How many a man has become a fool by all this."[44]

According to the conception of Athanasius, the fact which procures salvation for man is the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ. Luther certainly did not abandon this view but, he deepened and perfected it, and that was a permanent contribution. Herrmann assures us: "Luther got *beyond* the indefinite thought that with the entrance of Jesus into the world the Divine Essence came into the most intimate union with the human race, or with human nature. He bids any and every individual soul experience for itself that in the person of Jesus the Personal God Himself is exerting His love and creative power upon such particular individual."[45]

Sin

Although sin cannot be explained rationally it must be recognized as a destructive force in the affairs of mankind. As we search Luther's doctrine of sin for permanent contributions we shall content ourself by calling attention to but one. Luther did not fail to point out the awfulness of carnal sin, but even as his Master, Jesus Christ, he set himself most determinedly against sins committed against God, such as unbelief, pride, hypocrisy, and lack of brotherly love.

---

[43] 2nd Erl. ed. 20: 161.
[44] Erl. ed. 19: 15.
[45] Herrmann, Communion with God, page 156.
[46] Idem. page 176.

Redemption

Herrmann has characterized the permanent element in Luther's doctrine of redemption as follows: "The Protestant Christian, who can stand before God with the confidence of a child, must have found in Christ, to whom he owes that relationship to God, not some mysterious divine substance, but a living power, acting upon him, overwhelming him and announcing to his soul the will of the personal God."[47]

Eternal Life

Luther's profound observation, which he taught consistently, that eternal life begins here and now in the heart of such, who through faith have entered into a living communion with God, is among the most valuable contributions he has made to Protestant doctrine. It dignifies the worth of man's earthly existence with a value unknown to our Catholic brethren, and embraces an alluring hope for greater development in the Hereafter.

CONCLUSION

I close with a final quotation from Wilhelm Herrmann, a man who has gained a profound insight into the abiding elements to be found in the religious principles released and championed by the genius of Luther. "Luther's witness to that which makes a Christian to be a Christian is a treasure not yet sufficiently valued. It will quicken and advance, and perhaps bring deliverance to men in whom the yearning for God is not dead, to see how Luther came to that communion which gave him a joyful heart and a dauntless courage."[48]

---

[47] Wilhelm Herrmann, Communion with God, page 176.
[48] Idem. page 56.

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION

Prof. John O. Evjen, Ph.D.

Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

One of America's greatest philosophers had defined philosophy as "an unusually obstinate effort to think clearly and consistently." While this definition does not define, it expresses in a certain way that the philospher's road to knowledge is not a royal one. The real philosopher's life, too, has not always been of the royal order, considered in terms of outward comfort, fame and wealth. The reason is that, to many, philosophy and philosophers are objects of suspicion. Not everybody will share Cicero's admiration for philosophy when he paid his tribute to it as the Guide of Life.

The Fate and Reward of Some Philosophers

Socrates, the father of philosophic ethics, was forced to give his life for his chosen profession, being sentenced to drink a cup of poison. Aristotle, the greatest polyhistorian the world has ever known, after teaching thirteen years at Athens, was accused of blasphemy, and had to flee to avoid the fate of Socrates. Galileo, who regarded himself as a philosopher, was forced by a church tribunal to recant his ideas concerning the motion of the earth. And though he probably never said what has been attributed to him, "Yet it doth move," he, no doubt, thought it. Descartes, of France, found his native land intellectually circumscribed and went to Holland, where he for twenty years had to defend himself against the repeated attacks of the guild of scholastic clergy. Spinoza, of Holland, famed for his simple life as well as his remarkable mathematical philosophy, was excommunicated by the synagogue; and, in order to avoid persecutions at the hands of his Hebrew brethren, fled to the Hague, where he wrote philosophy and supported himself by polishing lenses, dying of consumption at the age of 44. Leibniz, of Germany, a polyhistorian second only to Aristotle, and a Protestant by creed, was persecuted by his brethren in faith on the groundless suspicion that he was "Cryptocatholic," since he looked with some favor upon effecting a union between Catholicism and Protestantism. Kant, famous for his categorical imperative, was deprived of the right of giving lectures on religion, in his own university, on the alleged ground that he was a heretic. Fichte was dismissed from his professorship at Jena, on a trumped-up charge of Atheism, though the University of Berlin later made him its rector. Rousseau, of French antecedents, was accused of Communism, though pedagogy has given this strange Back-to-Nature prophet a front seat in her hall of elects.

Such has been the fate of some philosophers. But they have, in other ways, had their reward. The erring judgment of an aristocratic group or a mob is far easier to bear than the self-inflicted penalty that comes from a wilful neglect of the best that human thought has transmitted to us.

Philosophy Once the Crowning of Studies

Philsophy was the crowning of studies in schools of higher learning from Plato to the beginning of the last century. Even today there is a remnant of its former dignity, in the practice of smaller colleges, where the president of the school generally is a professor of moral philosophy, which he imparts to his seniors before their graduation. In many instances this moral philosophy has come to be everything else but philosophy. However, the tradition of giving it is conserved, and may keep the way open for something better.

Results of a Dethroned Philosophy

Owing to the gradual divorcement of philosophy from science in the last three generations, not a little of the scientific output today falls flat. We have been told repeatedly that the average intelligence of our army boys was that of sixth graders. But any statement of that kind contains a twofold insult; to man, and to science. Measurements of, and reasoning about, mentality not based on a trusted philosophy's conception of human life, are absolutely worthless, whether they hail from physicians or psychologists or from the representatives of other professions not overly concerned about the history of thought. A great deal of this unfounded criticism of army mentality is due to last century's divorcement of philosophy from science. The criteria in testing the mental ability of the soldiers were not sufficiently warrantable from the standpoint of philosophy. Tests based on a purely natural-scientific psychology can do but scarce justice to anybody, and this kind of psychology seems to have been the Criterion Infallible for the tests employed. What about the finer ethical responses? Were they measured? Did they not exceed the interesting, innocent, comparatively undeveloped moral stage of a sixth-grader?

The divorcement of philosophy from science—whether social or natural science—is very evident today, says Professor Fr. Paulsen, one of our leading authorities on philosophy and pedagogy. It shows itself: (1) In the lack of logical thinking, in the lack of ability to define concepts sharply, to arrange the subject matter logically, to give precision to arguments; (2) in the want of fundamental concepts of philosophy. Quite often there is wanting any knowledge whatever of the philosophical questions involved and

their solution. When physicians, psychiatricts, biologists and physiologists face the general problems, for instance, the relation of the body to the soul, they know nothing about the endeavors of philosophy beginning with the 17th century, in regard to these problems. They are in need of established categories for the possible ways of conceiving them. One need only ply the pages of a Haeckel or a Du Bois-Reymond or a Vogt to see this. The same holds true of many jurists as well. When they write about law and morality, or morality and religion, one sees how pitiably they often get off the tracks. (3) A third result of the parting of science from philosophy is the lack of a philosophical world view. In reality, even educated people, yes scholars, are sadly equipped in this respect. They have seldom, if ever, given any consideration to the most profound and ultimate questions of existence. The result of this is that they become a prey to any new fad. Where Christian orthodoxy does not obtain, the prevailing world view is either the materialism of a Haeckel, or an absolute scepticism as indifference, which proclaims, "Of course, we cannot have any knowledge about those things."

The Business of Philosophy

Philosophy endeavors first of all to give a theory of knowledge, or *epistemology:* It investigates the nature, origin, limits and validity of knowledge. Secondly, it gives us a world view, a theory of life, or *metaphysics.* Thirdly, it teaches us how to think correctly, in *logic.* Logic, metaphysics and epistemology are the three *general* philosophical disciplines.

The *special* philosophical disciplines are natural philosophy, psychology, ethics and philosophy of law, aesthetics, philosophy of religion, philosophy of history. Some philosophers even add pedagogy, and regard philosophy of history as identical with sociology.

As to psychology, this branch is in the opinion of a majority still a branch of philosophy, and not of physiology or natural science. And correctly so. Mental phenomena are not mere correlates of physiological processes. They are not fully explicable in terms of behavior. Of late there have appeared many kinds of psychology on the market. Professor Thilly, of Cornell University, is right when he says: "What the philosophers desire is a psychological course which will do full justice to the facts of mental life and not falsify them to meet the demands of a scientific theory or method—courses of the kind given in European universities by men whose reputation as psychologists is beyond suspicion. Compayré made no mistake in maintaining that to different systems of psychology correspond different systems of education, and that an

idealist like Malebranche does not reason upon education after the manner of a "sensationalist" like Locke. This statement, applying to a special branch of philosophy, also applies to philosophy as a whole, which is proved by history.

Philosophy and Education in Greece and Rome

Greece had its pedagogy, or education, because it had its legislators and its practical philosophers: the first directing education in its practical details, the second making theoretical inquiries into the essential principles underlying the development of the human soul. In the writings of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle we see the first attempt to formulate a body of educational doctrine.

The Romans had no great educators, because they had no great philosophers. They displayed a strange insensibility for the graces of the intellect and heart. Whatever philosophy they had, they borrowed of Greece. Their forté was organization. They worked for practical ends, were extreme utilitarians. A taste for disinterested science and speculative inquiry was foreign to this race of warriors. Their literature is, on the whole, poor in original material for educational study, as their original contribution to philosophy is almost nihil.

Thought and Education in the Middle Age and the Renaissance

These periods of history contributed nothing profoundly original to philosophy or education. The middle age lived on the teachings of Augustine and scholaticism. Its literature, however, contains many fine psychological observations and a number of good socio-political suggestions, interspersed among the lines of its mighty tomes. Not least among its scholars was William Occam, of England, who anticipated modern psychology by maintaining that Will and not the Intellect is the essence of the soul. The Renaissance stood for the idealism of the Greeks. It also stood for free thought and a new conception of nature. Its leading philosopher, Bruno, who was burned at the stake, was an enthusiastic defender of art, a pantheist by religion. Its leading humanist, Erasmus, more a man of letters than a philosopher, preached a return to the classical literature of Greece. But withal, the Renaissance was a transitional period, with a far keener appreciation of aesthetics than of ethics, which really rivals psychology in its importance for education.

The Beginning of Public Education—the First Chairs in History and Psychology

Then came the Reformation, which stressed schools for the people. Its idea that man needs no ecclesiastic mediation made it

imperative that each person should learn to read, especially the Bible, and judge for himself. Luther stressed public school education; not, though, simply as a preparation for the Hereafter. He said: "Were there neither soul, heaven nor hell, it would still be necessary to have schools for affairs here below, as the history of the Greeks and Romans plainly teaches." He also advocated compulsory school attendance. To Luther belongs the honor of having advocated the first university professorship in history that the modern world knows of, the first chair in history being established in Switzerland. To his comrade Melanchthon, again, belongs the honor of having given the first series of lectures on psychology, under the name of "psychology": He was a good theologian, but remained a member of the faculty of philosophy in his university, even refusing to be ordained or to serve a congregation. Melanchthon for his great services to education was called preceptor Germaniae. Both he and Luther were influenced educationally by Aristotle; Luther to no small degree by the English philosopher William Occam, already alluded to. The struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism, ending finally in the thirty years war, made education more difficult in Germany but also more coveted than in states more inclined to individualism and utilitarianism.

English and French Contributions

A new departure in education is noted at the arrival of Francis Bacon, who over against dependence on reflection and reason advocated the extreme dependence on observation. Though its thinking is of the Renaissance type the Baconian school of philosophy soon showed its utilitarian influence on the educational system. Bacon wanted to get away from the logic of Aristotle, and mapped out his own table of sciences, which should carry on the inductive method.

Bacon did not offer much that was directly pedagogical. But he paved the way for a new world view, gave it a program, and tried to establish the methods it should follow. His influence on education, its end and means, is therefore indirect. We daily hear the strong echo of his cry "Vetustas cessit, ratio vicit!" (The ancient Age has passed, Reason has conquered). As a philosopher he directed man to Nature, and gave man Observation and Experiment as the keys he should use. He called forth in England an empirical philosophy, which through its empiricism of necessity fertilized and modified pedagogical theory and practice. Traces of Bacon are found everywhere in the writings of pedagogical critics and reformers of the 17th century; Andrea, Schupp, Ratke, Jungius, Alsted, and Comenius. Bacon expected everything from nature. He taught that one conquers nature by serving it. However, no great discovery has ever been made by following Bacon's methods.

He disregarded, even mocked, his big contemporaries like Kepler, Galileo, Gilbert, and Harvey, the real founders of a new natural science. His views on education were determined almost wholly by the utilitarian criterion. The end of science, he taught, was to make life richer here on earth. His well known and often quoted statement, "Knowledge is Power" shows Bacon's superficial thinking in nuce. He even exiled theology from the realm of sciences and mocked it as a sterile virgin dedicated to the Godhead. Bacon's influence was greatly increased by the French Encyclopedists, but soon waned again. His utilitarian world view has, however, put its stamp on education among the English speaking people. It obtains alas in too many of our own circles, which demands the teaching of "useful" subjects only, and fails to appreciate any idealistic trend in education.

Then Descartes came. Descartes and not Bacon, is the father of modern philosophy. No other thinker, says his countryman Compayre, has exercised a more decided influence on the destinies of education than Descartes. He wrote no system of pedagogy, but through his philosophical inquiries he changed the direction of human thinking. He banished from the school the old routine of mechanical processes of the exercise of pure memory, made a demand for rational methods derived from mathematics, methods that excite the intelligence, awaken clear and distinct ideas and provoke judgment and reflection. In reflecting on Descarte's services, Compayré makes the following important statement, the worth of which is enhanced by the fact that Compayré himself was a brilliant educator and a philosopher of considerable repute:

"Every system of philosophy contains in a germ a special system of education. From the mere fact that philosophers define, each in their own way, the nature and destiny of man, they come to different conclusions as to the aims and methods of education. Only a few of them have taken pains to deduce their principles, or the consequences that are involved in them, *but all of them, whether they will or not are educators.*"

John Locke followed. He was an empiricist in his system of philosophy, which was mainly psychology. He believed that there are no innate ideas: there is nothing in the intellect that has not been in the senses, before. Knowledge comes from sensation and reflexion. All mental training is therefore the result of experience. Individual training is better than the training received in a public school. Every person, so to speak, is a predisposed being through origin, family inclination, ability, temperament, and should be trained accordingly. He must have physical training as well as mental. Constant appeals must be made to the child's sense of

honor. The formation of character is important. Locke stresses the value of child's psychology. He advocates few rules, but many examples. The child must be given reasons for everything and be treated pretty much as a grownup. Locke stresses play, and advocates the play element even in the method of teaching. Aesop's Fables should be the child's primer; and not the Bible, unless it should be a Children's Bible. He regarded French as the most useful of foreign languages. Latin was only for the few. Grammar should be taught sparingly. Translations should take the place of classics. Greek was only for the exclusive scholar. Emphasis should be placed on practical subjects like geography, arithmetic, chronology, history, ethics, politics. Rhetoric and logic are of minor value. Dancing, drawing, riding, fencing, swimming are valuable accomplishments. Music has but little value.

That is the pedagogy of Locke, thoroughly realistic and utilitarian. It has no room for poetry and art. It excludes the aesthetical side of education, and sets aside imagination. It turns out a useful, prudent, calculating man of the world, but one that is lacking in idealism: a correct gentleman of the court, sober and self-controlled, natural, and at ease, sensible, straightforward, manly, and morally strict.

The educational enthusiasm of the 18th century goes back to Locke. It was based on the naive belief that if one wanted to, he could make every human being virtuous, wise, and happy. France got its full share of this pedagogy, especially from Rousseau, upon whom Locke exerted a great influence.

Rousseau brushed aside the artificial. He preached a back-to-nature program, but with a tremendous success. He was the first thinker to face the culture problem squarely and to offer a solution. The whole system of education was affected by this man's thoughts, for better or worse. Even his philosophy of law affected the drafting of our constitution, especially his treatise "Contract Social."

Without mentioning others, it can be said that the progress made in education in the eighteenth century was due in great part to the efforts of the philosophers of that age.

The Tide of Education in Germany Turned by Philosophy

In Germany, Kant turned the tide of education. His view on the composition of human nature, on the limits of understanding, and on duty gave a new direction to education in his country. Not least did Rousseau's ideals find an expression in Kant's view on education: to make his countrymen independent of the French courtly culture (which, he claimed, suppressed nature in every way), and to do away with class distinction.

Fichte, too, was deeply stirred by Rousseau's works, and wished for a new order. He advocated public education, taught the people to fight against the selfishness which family life encourages, and, on the whole, to make war against individualism and hold the banners of idealism high.

Hegel pointed to the value of sociological study, the law of contrasts in history, and historic development. His picture of the German schoolmaster and the school became the Prussian ideal, again showing the influence of philosophy on education.

Finally, Herbart must be mentioned, whose psychology was of the rigidly intellectualistic type, ruled by mechanics, a psychology that has exerted a tremendous influence even on American education but was doomed to fall on account of its mathematical artifices.

(*To be concluded*)

Die Schöpfungen des Heiligen Geistes: Die Kirche und das neue Leben.

Von Professor Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

A.

Die Kirche.

I.

Die soziale Wirkung des Heiligen Geistes durch die Gnadenmittel ist die Kirche. Sie ist der geschichtliche Ertrag des Werkes Christi. Die Kirche ist eine spezifische Schöpfung des Christentums. Das lehrt eine **religionsgeschichtliche Vergleichung der hauptsächlichsten Formen des religiösen Lebens** mit aller Deutlichkeit. Bei den meisten Naturvölkern und auch den hauptsächlichsten Geschichtsvölkern der alten Welt gibt es keine spezifisch religiöse Gemeinschaftsform. Finden sich die engsten menschlichen Bande im Clan und im Stamm ausgedrückt, so ist auch die Religion Stammessache und hat außerhalb des Stammes keine besondre Lebensform. Kommt es bei den Völkern zur rechtlich-politischen Organisation des gesamten Lebens, so schmiegt sich die Religion restlos in diese Formen ein. Entstehen kleine Stadtstaaten wie in Griechenland, so wird auch die Organisation der Religion eine städtische; bilden sich Weltreiche wie im alten Orient oder besonders später in Rom, so gewinnt die Religion eine Ausdehnung ihres Organismus, der wenigstens in der Kaiserzeit die Struktur des Weltstaates empfängt. Die Religion führt mithin in einem weitverbreiteten Typus der außerchristlichen Religionsgeschichte in ihrer Sozialbildung durch die vorhandenen natürlichen und politisch-rechtlichen Gesellungen, vornehmlich durch den Staat. Mit Recht sagte R. Rothe: „Auf dem Gebiet des Heidentums konnte sich vor der Allgewalt des Staates die Kirche nicht bilden“

Auch im **alten Israel** fällt noch die religiöse Organisation mit der des Volkes zusammen; auch hier gibt es keine Kirche neben und hinausgehend über die natürlich-völkische Gemeinschaft; nur darin besteht der Unterschied von den übrigen Völkern der Antike, daß bei dieser Ineinschmelzung das wertgebende Metall das religiöse ist. Diese Struktur ist auch für den **Islam** die eigentlich normale. In Kalifat ist die Einheit der geistigen und weltlichen Gewalt als dauerndes Ideal proklamiert. Das Auseinanderfallen der religiösen und staatlichen Gemeinschaft ist für den Muhammedanismus etwas durchaus unnatürliches. Er hat sich nur unter dem Zwang der Verhältnisse und in Nachahmung des Christentums dem Kirchentypus, das heißt einer reinreligiösen selbständigen Sozialbildung angenähert.

Die außerchristliche Religionsgeschichte bietet neben der Natur-

und Staatsformen für die Religion eine besondre Bildung, nämlich die der Sekte. Die soziale Form der religionsgeschichtlich bedeutsamsten Sphäre, der indischen Religionsgeschichte, hat nämlich den Typus der Sekte hervorgerufen. Der Buddhismus hat sich an keine der naturgegebenen Lebensformen wie Familie und Stamm, aber ebensowenig an die geschichtlich gewordenen Gebilde wie die Kaste, Nation, Staat angeschlossen. Er hat aber ebensowenig die religiöse Form der Kirche als einer gottgegebenen, für die ganze Welt bestimmten Stiftung ins Dasein gerufen, sondern vielmehr die ethische Form der Sekte geschaffen. Die Sekte ist schon beim Buddhismus ein kritisches Gebilde, kritisch gegenüber der „Welt" wie gegenüber den überkommenen Religionen. Sie ist eine Schöpfung der Freiheit; die Zugehörigkeit zu ihr ist auf eine bewußte Tat des Einzelnen gegründet, wobei die eigene Entscheidung letztlich auf eine persönliche „innere Erleuchtung" zurückgeführt wird. Dieser Individualismus ist aber ein gemäßigter, denn er wird erweitert durch den Willen, eine begrenzte Anzahl von Menschen für die gleiche Stellung zu gewinnen. Der eigentliche Zweck der Sekte ist ein ethischer, nämlich sich und die Gemeinde durch Zurückhaltung von der Welt sündenfrei zu gestalten und damit zu erlösen. Sektencharakter gewannen in der vorchristlichen Religionsgeschichte auch die Mysterienreligionen der ausgehenden Antike. — **Der geschichtliche Tatbestand in bezug auf die Sozialform der Religion in der außerchristlichen Religionsgeschichte ist mithin ein doppelter: Entweder die Religion schmiegt sich den natürlichen und geschichtlichen Sozialbildungen der Familie, des Stammes, Volkes vor allem des Staates oder dem Individualismus des natürlichen Menschen an und bildet dadurch den Typus der Sekte. Der Begriff der Kirche fehlt vollständig in der außerchristlichen Religionsgeschichte.**

II.

Die Kirche bahnt sich innerhalb der **israelitischen Religionsgeschichte** an. Die Wurzel des Kirchenbegriffes in Israel liegt in den Gedankengängen, welche die religiöse Gemeinde auf eine freie, supranaturale und gnädige Wahl Gottes, die jene aus dem Volk aussondert, zurückführt. Diese religiös-sittliche Schöpfung unterscheidet sich ebenso von den natürlichen und geschichtlichen Gebilden der Menschheit, wie von der individuellen Naturbestimmtheit des einzelnen Menschen. Weder Volk noch Staat, weder natürliche Individualität noch Sekte sind die dem eigenartigen Charakter der spezifischen Offenbarungsreligion angemessenen Formen. Vielmehr entspricht dieser nur eine auf Gottes Auswahl zurückgehende, durch ihn religiös-sittlich umgestaltete Gemeinde von Menschen, die ihrem Wesen nach alle Menschen umfassen kann. Hiermit beginnt ein eigenartiges, neues, rein religiöses Sozialgebilde aufzuleuchten, in welchem die Kirche vorbereitet und angedeutet wird.

An diese Gedankengänge knüpft Jesus ebenso bestimmt an, wie er sich von den heidnischen fernhält. Der Herr hat nicht daran gedacht, die familiäre und religiöse Gemeinschaft zusammenfallen zu lassen; im Gegenteil hat er das Verlassen von Vater und Mutter um des Reiches Gottes willen verlangt und als seine wahren Verwandten nur die bezeichnet, die das Wort Gottes hören. Ebensowenig hat Jesus im Staat die adäquate Form des religiösen Lebens gesehen. Das jüdische Volk für das Reich Gottes zu gewinnen, ist gewiß Jesu Wille gewesen; aber niemals hat er den natürlich-sozialen Volkszusammenhang als genügende Legitimation für den Eingang in das Reich Gottes anerkannt. Genau wie bei den Propheten ergab sich bei Jesus als Erfolg seiner Predigt, daß nur ein begrenzter Kreis auf seine religiös-sittlichen Angebote und Forderungen eingeht. Nur diese Schar galt ihm als die Gemeinde Gottes. Damit aber ist positiv die Idee der Kirche erreicht und gewollt, als einer von allen natürlichen Sozialbildungen gänzlich unabhängigen, rein religiös-sittlichen Gemeinschaft, die Jesus schuf. „Schon die Predigt des Täufers war in gewissem Sinn gemeindebildend, denn dadurch, daß viele, nicht alle sich taufen ließen, schieden sich vor dem Gericht die, welche auf das nahe Reich sich rüsteten von der Volksgemeinde. Jesus aber hat von Anfang an unter dem Bild des Fischfanges, der Erntearbeit, der Sammlung der zerstreuten Schafe zu einer Herde unter ihm als Hirten, die Bildung einer Gemeinde des Himmelreiches als den Zweck seiner Berufsarbeit bezeichnet, an welcher die Apostel teilnehmen sollten. Er hatte seine Jüngerschaft in der ganzen Bergpredigt und sonst angeleitet, sich als eine von den Leuten abgesonderte, zu Gott als ihrem Vater in besonderem Verhältnis stehende und mit besonderen Aufgaben betraute Genossenschaft anzusehen. Im Gegensatz zu dem zeitgenössischen Israel, das dem Gericht anheimfällt, hatte er seine Jüngerschaft als seine Familie und Hausgenossenschaft, als seine Hochzeitsgäste, und anderseits als eine zwar kleine, aber zur Herrschaft berufene Herde genannt." (Zahn, Matthäus-Kommentar.) Bei dieser Sachlage hat es gar nichts Ueberraschendes und Auffallendes, wenn Jesus seine Gemeinde gelegentlich seine „ecclesia" nannte, zumal dieses Wort längst von den verschiedenartigsten Vereinigungen, sogar von Zusammenrottungen von Frevlern, aber auch von der Partei der Frommen in Israel und von der Zunft der Schriftgelehrten gebraucht worden war. (Zahn.) — Infolgedessen ist gar kein Grund, mit Harnack und andern Jesus den Gebrauch des Wortes Kirche in Matth. 16, 18 und 18, 17 abzusprechen und für eine spätere Interpolation zu erklären. Jesus hat nicht nur eine Kirche gewollt, sondern auch gestiftet. Er tat es durch die Berufung und Zusammenfassung seiner Jünger als derjenigen, welchen durch den Geist Gottes die rechte Erkenntnis seiner Person offenbart ist,

die ihn als den Messias bekennen, dadurch Vergebung der Sünden und ein neues Leben empfangen. Mit seinem Wort und Geist ausgerüstet, werden diese Jünger zunächst im Volk Israel und darüber hinausgehend für den Glauben an Jesus und den Eintritt in seine Gemeinde werben.

Die Kirche ist das soziale Produkt der geschichtlichen Wirksamkeit Gottes in Jesus, durch deren Vermittlung sich diese fortpflanzt. Sie ist eine reinreligiöse, gottgewirkte Größe, für die Glaube und Bekenntnis, Wort und Geist konstitutiv sind. Sie ist ein Verband menschlicher Persönlichkeiten, aber auf Grund der Wahl und Wirkung Jesu Christi.

Das Bewußtsein Kirche zu sein ist eine der charakteristischsten Merkmale schon der ersten Christenheit, sowohl der Urgemeinde wie des Paulus. Man führte die eigene geistliche Existenz ganz und gar auf die Wirksamkeit und Auswahl Gottes zurück. Entsprechend dem Willen und Wirken Gottes im alten Bund fühlte man sich als das Volk Gottes, als das neue Israel. In keiner Weise dagegen hielt man die Kirche Gottes für eine menschliche Bildung durch den Zusammenschluß Gleichgesinnter. Auf das Allerengste wurde die Beziehung zwischen Kirche und Christus geknüpft. Die Kirche ist der Leib Christi, die Erfüllung, die Vervollständigung Christi (Eph. 1, 23). Ist Christus der Heilsmittler, so ist dementsprechend die Kirche die Gemeinde des Heils zunächst in dem Sinn, daß sie und zwar sie allein das Heil und die Gnade empfängt. Infolgedessen kommen ihr eine Reihe von Bezeichnungen zu, die diesen Besitz aussagen. Heißt sie eine Behausung Gottes im Geist, so wird damit festgestellt, daß das göttliche Heilsprinzip, der Geist, in ihr seine dauernde Wohnstätte gefunden hat. Werden ihre Glieder als die Heiligen bezeichnet, so erscheinen die Christen damit als diejenigen, welche unter der heiligenden Wirkung Gottes stehen. Als die Erlösten und Geheiligten befinden sich die Glieder der Kirche in scharfem Gegensatz zur Welt, auf die einzuwirken aber die Aufgabe der Kirche ist. Mit dem Tatbestand, daß sich innerhalb der empirisch-geschichtlichen Kirche Glieder finden, die ihr nicht in wahrhaft religiösem Sinn angehören, beginnen schon die Apostel auf Grund der Tatsachen zu rechnen (Apg. 5; 1. Joh. 2, 18; Paulus). Diese gehören dann zwar nicht zu der eigentlichen Grundfeste Gottes, aber doch wie wertlose Gefässe zum Hause Gottes (2. Tim. 2, 19). Sind sie offenbare Sünder, so sollen sie aus der Kirche auch äußerlich ausgeschlossen werden (Matth. 18, 17; 1. Kor. 5, 1; 1. Tim. 1, 20; Apg. 2, 2). — So ist im Neuen Testament die Kirche in verschiedenster Richtung als die neue Schöpfung Jesu Christi beschrieben. „Eine Kirche gibt es nur im Christentum. Die tatsächliche Verwirklichung dieser Stiftung des Herrn war für die antike

Welt eine absolut neue, unerhörte, unverständliche Erscheinung." (H. Schmidt.)

III. a.

Innerhalb der christlichen Religionsentwicklung ist gerade im Kirchenbegriff eine scharfe Differenzierung durch seine **verschiedenartige Ausprägung im Katholizismus und Protestantismus** erfolgt. Im Wesen der Kirche liegt es, in die Sichtbarkeit dieser Wirklichkeit einzugehen und sich in ihr zu organisieren. Das beobachten wir schon im Urchristentum und in der Zeit der ältesten Kirche. Darin liegt noch nichts spezifisch Katholisches. Dieses setzt erst in dem Augenblick ein, wo man eine bestimmte äußere rechtliche Organisation zum Wesen der wahren, eigentlichen Kirche rechnet. Der römische Kirchenbegriff hat sich erst allmählich gebildet; er war schon im Mittelalter vollendet, wurde aber erst im Gegensatz zum Protestantismus im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert besonders durch den Jesuiten Bellarmin auf die schärfsten Formeln gebracht, die seitdem immer wieder reproduziert werden. So liest man zum Beispiel in der Schrift von Melchers „Lehre von der Kirche," 4. Auflage, 1881: „Die Kirche ist die sichtbare Gemeinschaft aller Christen auf Erden, welche durch das Bekenntnis desselben Glaubens und durch die Teilnahme an denselben Sakramenten miteinander vereinigt sind unter dem gemeinsamen Oberhaupt, dem römischen Oberhirten als Nachfolger des Apostelfürsten Petrus, und den ihm untergeordneten Bischöfen, als Nachfolgern der übrigen Apostel." **Der römische Kirchenbegriff** hat nach dem einstimmigen Zeugnis seiner Vertreter zum entscheidenden Merkmal: **Die Einbeziehung der rechtlich-hierarchischen Organisation in das Wesen der für sichtbar erklärten Heilsanstalt.** Der berühmte protestantische Kirchenrechtslehrer Sohm formuliert den Tatbestand vollkommen korrekt katholisch in der schlagenden Formel: „Das ganze Wesen des Katholizismus beruht darin, daß er die Rechtsordnungen als notwendig für die Kirche und zwar als notwendig für das geistliche Wesen derselben bejaht."

III. b.

Die **Reformation** ist und bleibt in erster Linie ein kirchengeschichtliches Ereignis. Ihre Bedeutung besteht darum vornehmlich in der Kritik des katholischen Kirchenbegriffes und in der Ausgestaltung des reformatorischen im Anschluß an das Urchristentum. Luther hat alle die aus einem göttlichen Kirchenrechte hergeleiteten Elemente in der sichtbaren Kirche kritisch zersetzt. Er wandte sich nicht nur gegen die konkrete Verderbnis des damaligen Papsttums, sondern prinzipiell gegen eine Institution, nach welcher die Kirche Christi als religiöse Gemeinschaft ein sichtbares Haupt haben sollte. **Der Begriff der unsichtbaren Kirche soll zunächst negativ das Wesen der Kirche vom Rechte und jeder äußeren sichtbaren Organisation**

lösen. Positiv kann dann das Wesen der Kirche nur in der religiös-sittlichen Sphäre liegen. Die Kirche ist nach Luther die Gemeinde der Heiligen und Gläubigen, das heißt der Kreis derjenigen Menschen, die unter der erlösenden, sündenvergebenden Wirkung Jesu stehen und sich diese Gaben innerlich im Glauben aneignen. Diese Gemeinde ist eine sittlich-religiöse Realität. Denn „unsichtbar" bedeutet in Bezug auf die Kirche alles andre als irreal. Die unsichtbare Kirche kommt nur durch das sichtbare Wort und Sakrament zustande und wirkt sich in diesen wesentlich aus. Schon insofern ist die unsichtbare Kirche wesentlich sichtbar. Luther kennt nicht zwei Kirchen, eine unsichtbare und eine sichtbare, sondern **nur eine unsichtbare Kirche, die sich durch sichtbare Medien erbaut und erhält,** aus denen darum der Gläubige mit absoluter Sicherheit das Vorhandensein der unsichtbaren Kirche und ihrer geistigen Früchte erschließen kann. „Man würde sich täuschen, wenn man annehmen würde, diese Bedeutung der Kirche fürs christliche Leben und überhaupt für die Vollendung der göttlichen Heilsratschlüsse auf der Erde sei für Luther geringer, weniger umfassend als für den Katholizismus, sondern eben jene geistige, übrigens in voller Realität existierende, auch im Aeußeren sich offenbarende Gemeinde, die wahre Kirche, ist für Luther in vollem Sinne die Mutter aller Gläubigen." (Köstlin.)

Luthers Gedanken sind mit seltener Treue und Schärfe in den protestantischen Bekenntnissen in klassischer Form wiedergegeben. Augustana und Apologie VII und VIII definieren die Kirche „proprie" als „congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium." Zu ihr gehören als wesentliches äußeres Kennzeichen, daß in ihr „evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta," nicht aber „similes traditiones humanae." Diese Kirche im eigentlichen Sinne ist keine „civitas Platonica" das heißt kein utopisches Gebilde der Phantasie, weil nicht nur Wort und Sakrament äußerlich vorhanden sind, sondern auch die wirklichen Gläubigen tatsächlich auf Erden leben, wenn auch „sparsi per totum orbem." Ausschließlich zu der „externa societas signorum" gehören in dieser Zeitlichkeit Heuchler und Ungläubige; zur wahren Kirche gehören diese nur „nomine," nicht „re." Luther selbst hat in den Bekenntnissen seine Auffassung von der Kirche auf besonders schlichte und packende Formeln gebracht, wenn er in den Schmalkaldischen Artikeln die Kirche definiert als „die heiligen Gläubigen und die Schäflein, die ihres Hirten Stimme hören," „eine christliche Gemeinde oder Sammlung, eine heilige Christenheit." — Zur Verwaltung der Gnadenmittel ist das kirchliche Amt eingesetzt, zu dessen öffentlicher Ausübung nur der „rite vocatus" berechtigt ist, dem dann die Ordination zukommt. Die Ausgestaltung des kirchlichen Amtes zum römisch-politischen

Episkopat und Papat gehört nicht zum Wesen der Kirche und besteht nicht „iure divino."

IV.

An dem altprotestantischen Kirchenbegriff hat in neuerer Zeit nicht nur der Neuprotestantismus, sondern auch der **hochkirchliche lutherische Konfessionalismus**, repräsentiert durch Männer wie Vilmar, Stahl, Kliefoth, Kritik geübt. In einer Schrift aus diesem Kreise heißt es, „daß in dem Dogma von der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche Luther, die lutherischen Symbole und die orthodoxen Dogmatiker der lutherischen Kirche über dem Eifer der Negation gegen die Römischen nicht zur vollen Ausführung der Lutherischen Affirmation gekommen sind." Wider diese Meinung hat sich besonders das **Erlanger Luthertum** in Männern wie Harleß, Höfling, Hofmann gewandt. Nach ihrer Ueberzeugung sind sämtliche Reformvorschläge des hochkirchlichen Konfessionalismus — der Ersatz der unsichtbaren Kirche durch die sichtbare Gemeinde der Getauften, die Annahme eines selbständigen, auf besondre göttliche Stiftung zurückgehenden Amtes, die Hinzurechnung des Kirchenregimentes zu den wesentlichen Elementen der Kirche, — an den Prinzipien der Reformation gemessen keine Fortentwicklung und auch keine Vorbereitung eines neuen Kirchentypus. Sie stellen vielmehr Rückschritte dar und sind mehr oder minder weitgehende Rückbewegungen zum römischen Kirchentypus mit seiner Aufnahme des Rechtes und äußerer Institutionen in das Wesen der Kirche.

Der **Neuprotestantismus** hat nicht minder Reformen und Umgestaltungen des altprotestantischen Kirchenbegriffes vorzunehmen versucht. Unter dem Einfluß der rein ethischen Auffassung des Reiches Gottes bei Kant, hat **Ritschl** und noch stärker eine Reihe seiner Schüler wie Rade eine **„Ethisierung" der Kirche** gefordert. An die Stelle des religiös offenbarungsgemäßen Kirchenbegriffes soll eine ethische Gesinnungsgemeinschaft — mit religiösem Hintergrund — treten, die sich praktisch betätigen soll. Allein so gewiß zur Kirche auch eine hohe sittliche Gemeinschaft und eine entsprechende praktische Betätigung gehören, droht doch hier eine prinzipielle Verschiebung der Elemente. Die Kirche ist in erster Linie eine Schöpfung Gottes durch die religiöse Verkündigung Jesu, und dementsprechend eine Gemeinschaft des Glaubens, aus der dann erst die entsprechende sittliche Gesinnungsverbundenheit und Aktivität erwächst. — Viel stärker aber ist die Umwandlung des altprotestantisch-biblischen Kirchenbegriffes bei dem Heidelberger Theologen **R. Rothe** gewesen, der letztlich nichts anders erstrebte, als eine Auflösung der Kirche überhaupt. Nach seiner Meinung geht das Christentum wesentlich darauf aus, sich immer vollständiger zu verweltlichen, das heißt sich der kirchlichen Form, die es bei seinem Eintritt in die Welt

antreten mußte, zu entkleiden, um die allgemein menschliche, die an sich sittliche Lebensgestalt anzunehmen. Die letztere ist für Rothe — in der Nachfolge Hegels — der moderne Kulturstaat. **Die Kirche soll sich mehr und mehr in den Staat auflösen.** „Der vollendete Staat schließt die Kirche aus." — Dieses Ideal ist aber nichts anders als eine Wiederaufnahme des alten vorchristlichen Ideales, einer auch die religiöse Gemeinschaft in sich bergenden staatlichen Organisation. Der geschichtliche Fortschritt des Christentums mit der Schöpfung einer spezifisch religiösen Sozialform, der Kirche wird hier wieder rückgängig gemacht — eine für die biblisch-reformatorische Theologie unmögliche Stellungnahme.

Eine andre Richtung im Neuprotestantismus sucht die Kirche möglichst der **Sekte** anzunähern, sie aus einer göttlichen Schöpfung zu einem Produkte menschlicher Individuen und ihrer Entschlüsse zu machen. Sie ist schon von **Schleiermacher** angebahnt und tritt dann besonders deutlich bei **Troeltsch** hervor. Allerdings wollte dieser sich nicht einfach für den Sektentypus entscheiden, sondern aus Kirche und Sekte ein neues Gebilde entstehen lassen, von dem er jedoch bekennen muß, „das Problem der Organisation religiöser Gemeinschaften ist heute dunkler als je."

V.

Allen diesen Kritiken und Reformvorschlägen gegenüber wird die **Dogmatik** wesentlich bei den Prinzipien der reformatorisch-biblischen Kirchenauffassung stehen bleiben dürfen, die wir nach den eingehenden Erörterungen in folgende **kurze Thesen** zusammenfassen können:

1. Unter Kirche ist die Gemeinschaft derjenigen Menschen zu verstehen, in welchen Christus durch den Geist, vermittels der geschichtlichen Gnadenmittel Glauben und neues Leben hergestellt hat, und die darum ihrerseits mit den gleichen Mitteln christliche Religion und Sittlichkeit zu verbreiten suchen. Das untrügliche, sichtbare Kennzeichen einer solchen Gemeinschaft sind allein die Gnadenmittel in urchristlicher Bestimmtheit. Für ihre Verwendung ist ein geordneter und regelmäßiger Dienst, ein „Amt" notwendig, dagegen keinerlei bestimmte äußere Organisationsformen. Bestehen auch die Gnadenmittel und leben die von ihnen erreichten Menschen in dieser sichtbaren Welt, so können letztere doch um des unsichtbaren Charakters der in ihnen vollzogenen religiösen Wirkungen willen nicht äußerlich abgegrenzt werden. Daher kann die wahre eigentliche Kirche eine unsichtbare, aber durchaus nicht unwirkliche heißen. Sie ist als solche Gegenstand des Glaubens und zwar „una, sancta, apostolica et katholica" und außerhalb ihrer kein Heil.

2. Indem die Kirche durch die Gnadenmittel in die sichtbare, sündliche Welt hineinreicht, ist sowohl diese in der Lage sich mit

jenen äußerlich in Verbindung zu setzen, ohne sich innerlich von ihnen beeinflussen zu lassen, wie die Kirche einer sündlichen Beeinflussung ausgesetzt. Dadurch entsteht die in der Geschichte reichlich zur Wirklichkeit gewordene Möglichkeit, daß sich ein weiterer Kreis von Menschen nur äußerlich empirisch, aber nicht innerlich mit den Gnadenmitteln verbindet. Diese „Kirche" im weiteren uneigentlichen Sinn ist keine einheitliche, heilige, allgemeine, apostolische und gilt von ihr nicht der Satz, daß außerhalb ihrer kein Heil sei. Der relative Wert der einzelnen Partikularkirche bestimmt sich nach dem Maß, wie sie den religiös-geschichtlichen Charakter der wahren Kirche und ihrer Gnadenmittel für das äußere Wesen ihrer Organisation konstitutiv sein läßt.

3. Hängt die Existenz der Kirche von der Handhabung der Gnadenmittel ab, so ist eine Einrichtung für ihre regelmäßige und geordnete Handhabung, das heißt aber ein kirchlicher Dienst notwendig, der darum auch von Gott und Christus mit der Bindung der Kirche an die Gnadenmittel gewollt und gestiftet ist. (Matth. 28, 19; Apg. 6, 4; 2. Kor. 5, 18; Aug. V.) Seine sich im Urchristentum erst allmählich ausbildende Uebertragung an Einzelne zu einem besondern amtlichen Beruf erfolgt auf Grund einer der gesamten Gemeinde eignenden Vollmacht zum Dienst und des göttlichen Hinweises auf bestimmte Persönlichkeiten, vermöge einer charismatischen Naturausrüstung (1. Kor. 12, 29) oder Lebensführung etwa durch besondre Vorbereitung. Die Form dieser Uebertragung ist das „rite vocatus" (Aug. XIV), dem gegenüber die Ordination nur „publica testificatio vocationis" und betende Anempfehlung des Amtsträgers an Gott ist. Die nähere Gestaltung des kirchlichen Amtes und erst recht aller übrigen Formen der kirchlichen Organisation und des Kultus sind nicht „iuro divino" und deshalb nicht mehr in der Dogmatik zu behandeln.

B.

Das neue Leben, hier zeitlich, dort ewiglich.

In der Erklärung des dritten Artikels verbindet Luther die Kirche auf das engste mit der Schöpfung des neuen Lebens in den einzelnen Christen, das er sowohl als ein zeitliches wie ein ewiges verstehen lehrt: „In welcher Christenheit er mir und allen Gläubigen täglich alle Sünden reichlich vergibt und am jüngsten Tag mich und alle Toten auferwecken wird und mir samt allen Gläubigen in Christo ein ewiges Leben geben wird. **„Die letzte Aufgabe der Dogmatik ist es, dies neue Leben hier zeitlich dort ewiglich** — wie es in Luthers Erklärung zur zweiten Bitte des Vaterunsers heißt — **darzustellen."**

In Bezug auf das neue zeitliche, vom Geist durch die Gnadenmittel in den einzelnen Gliedern der wahren Kirche gewirkte Leben

hat die christliche Dogmatik erst später eine bestimmte Lehrform in dem sogenannten „**ordo salutis**“ ausgebildet. (Sachlich Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts, dem Namen nach erst Anfang des 18. Jahrhunderts.) Bei dieser Heilsordnung kann es sich nur um eine — der Klarheit dienende — logische Zerlegung in einzelne Stufen handeln, die im wirklichen Leben normalerweise zusammenfallen. Die grundlegenden Bestandteile des neuen Lebens, Rechtfertigung und Wiedergeburt, sind schon in der Lehre von der christlichen Gewißheit, die in ihnen ihre letzten subjektiven Fundamente hat behandelt worden. Soweit das neue Leben durch die Aktivität des Menschen erhalten, fortgebildet und konkret durchgeführt wird, macht es den Gegenstand der christlichen Ethik aus. **Die Dogmatik hat hier diejenigen Akte Gottes zu schildern, durch welche das neue Leben zustande kommt und diejenigen Formen, in welchen es von seiten des Menschen angeeignet wird.**

I.

Der erste innergeschichtliche Akt Gottes, durch welchen er einen Menschen das Heil in Christo zugänglich macht, ist die **Berufung**. Diese erleuchtet den Einzelnen über den Inhalt des Heiles (1. Petri 2, 9; 2. Kor. 4, 4; Eph. 1, 18; 3, 9; kl. Katech.), erweckt ihn aus seinem Sündenschlaf (Röm. 13, 2; Eph. 5, 14) und verbindet ihn erfolgreich mit Christus und seiner Gemeinde (Matth. 9, 13; 1. Kor. 1, 9; 1. Thess. 4, 7; 2. Thess. 2, 14; 2. Tim. 1, 9; Phil. 2, 14; Röm. 1, 7; 9, 2). Auch abgesehen von dem menschlichen Verhalten, seiner sofortigen Zustimmung oder Verzögerung kann die Berufung in einem länger dauernden Prozeß verlaufen, in welchem Gott selbst zunächst vorbereitend auf die Erkenntnis wirkt und erst dann den Willen umgestaltet. — Durch die Berufung wird der Mensch mit Christus verbunden und empfängt dessen Heilsgaben in ihrer unauflöslichen Einheit. Sofern Christus unsre Gerechtigkeit ist und bringt, empfängt der Mensch die **Rechtfertigung**, sofern Christus aber zugleich Heiligung und Leben ist (1. Kor. 1, 30; Joh.) tritt die Wiedergeburt ein. Beide Rechtfertigung und Heiligung fallen zeitlich zusammen; aber kausal angesehen ist **die Rechtfertigung der Grund unsrer Wiedergeburt** und nicht umgekehrt der neue sittliche Lebenstand die Ursache von Gottes Gnade. Denn die — forensische — Gerechtsprechung erfolgt auf Grund des geschichtlichen Versöhnungswerkes allein aus Gnade um Christi willen. Denn nur dann kann in dem Menschen Heilsgewißheit entstehen, wenn diese nicht auf das in der Zeitlichkeit immer nur unvollkommene subjektive neue Leben basiert wird, sondern auf die objektiv abgeschlossene Heilstat Gottes. Diese Auffassung der Rechtfertigung entspricht allein der Lehre Jesu und der Apostel. Der Grundgedanke der Predigt Jesu von der freien gnädigen Zu-

eignung der Sündenvergebung und Gotteskindschaft an jeden Menschen, ist von Paulus nur schärfer terminologisch und antithetisch wider die Gesetzesreligion im Begriff der Rechtfertigung des Sünders, der vor Gott kein Recht hat, formuliert worden. Jesu Erlösung ist der Realgrund der Rechtfertigung. **Diese besteht im Unterschied zu der durch eigene Werke hergestellten Rechtbeschaffenheit in der gänzlich unverdienten Gerechtsprechung. Durch sie rechnet Gott die Sünde nicht an, vergibt sie und reiht positiv den Menschen in den Stand der Gotteskindschaft ein.**

Während die altkirchlichen **Bekenntnisse** nur die Sündenvergebung kennen, wurde durch die Reformation vermöge des gleichen Gegensatzes wider die katholische Gesetzesreligion die Rechtfertigungslehre in Paulinischer Schärfe erneuert. Augustana IV läßt das durch den Glauben empfangene und auf ihn sich beziehende Rechtfertigungsurteil auf Grund der Erlösung durch Christus erfolgen, im Gegensatz zu jeder am Gesetze orientierten moralischen Leistung. Mit der Rechtfertigung wird bei Luther und den älteren Bekenntnisschriften die **Wiedergeburt** und Erneuerung durch den Geist aufs engste verbunden, ja fast identifiziert. Die Sündenvergebung oder Rechtfertigung, „iustum pronuntiari seu reputari," ist und bewirkt zugleich das „ex iniusto iustum effici seu regenerari." Erst in späterer Zeit wurde zur Abwehr katholisierender Bestrebungen Rechtfertigung und Wiedergeburt in der Konkordienformel und in der alten Dogmatik stärker und in nicht immer glücklicher Formulierung von einander getrennt. — In der **neueren Theologie** ist bei Schleiermacher die Rechtfertigung aus einem objektiven Akt Gottes zu einer subjektiven inneren Zuständlichkeit gemacht worden; bei dem Biblizisten Beck erscheint sie wesentlich als eine sittliche Umschaffung, während der Biblizist Cremer aber auch Ritschl die Rechtfertigung rein forensisch auffassen. In besonderm Maß hat das umfassende biblisch-reformatorische Verständnis der Rechtfertigung und ihres Verhältnisses zur Wiedergeburt, wie es oben dargelegt wurde, der verstorbene Hallenser Theologe Kähler erneuert.

Durch Rechtfertigung und Wiedergeburt, die Gott dauernd durch seine Gnadenmittel im Menschen wirksam erhält, wird der Christ so eng mit Gott verbunden, daß er mit ihm in die innigste Lebensgemeinschaft tritt. Die alte Dogmatik nennt diese Stufe im „ordo salutis: **unio mystica.**" Man wird an dieser Formel, die besonders Ritschl bekämpft hat, festhalten dürfen, wenn man von dieser Einigung alle pantheistischen Vorstellungen einer Substanzverschmelzung von Gottheit und Menschheit und alle sinnlich-erotischen Vorstellungen fernhält und sie im Sinn von Joh. 14, 23; 17, 26; Röm. 8, 9; Gal. 11, 20 auffaßt.

II.

Diese Akte Gottes, Berufung, Rechtfertigung, Wiedergeburt, rufen im Menschen eine entsprechende Rezeptivität hervor: **den Glauben. Die subjektive Grundform, in welcher die göttlichen Akte angeeignet und durchgeführt werden ist der Glaube.** In der Schrift erscheint er sowohl als eine Wirkung Gottes (Röm. 1, 16; Phil. 1, 22; 1. Thess. 2, 13), wie als eine Leistung des Menschen (Joh. 6, 29; 1. Joh. 3, 23; 1. Thess. 1, 3). Er schließt die Erkenntnis und gewisse Ueberzeugung von der Wirklichkeit der Glaubensobjekte hinsichtlich ihrer ewigen und geschichtlichen, in Gegenwart und Zukunft bestehenden Realität in sich. (Matth. 18, 6; Joh. 17, 8; 1. Joh. 4, 1; 4, 16; Hebr. 2, 1; 10, 22; Röm. 10, 9; Eph. 4, 13). Weitere Grundbestandteile alles echten Glaubens sind der kindliche Gehorsam und das unbegrenzte Vertrauen gegenüber Gott und seinem Willen (Jak. 1, 6; Röm. 1, 5; 10, 16; 9, 33; Gal. 3, 26; 5, 5; Joh. 8, 12). Der Glaube ist die allumspannende seelische Zuständigkeit, in welcher sich der Mensch dem Evangelium zuwendet und seine Berufung annimmt. Er ist die Zustimmung und das Vertrauen auf die Rechtsprechung und die Sündenvergebung; die Rezeptivität, die sich die Kräfte der Wiedergeburt aneignet und sie in die Produktivität sittlichen Handlens umwandelt.

Gerade die reformatorischen **Bekenntnisse** geben dem Glauben die umfassende Bedeutung, sodaß in ihm das ganze neue Leben der Christen besteht. Der Glaube erscheint als ein „opus spiritus." Er ist nicht bloß eine äußerliche „notitia historiae," ein intellektuelles Verhalten, sondern als „fides specialis" ist er eine ganz individuelle Gemüts- und Willensreaktion, ein „velle et accipere oblatam promissionem remissionis." Er wird zugleich zum Ausgangspunkt für die „nova vita." Umfassend charakterisiert Apologie IV den Glauben in seiner Bedeutung: „quod sola fide consequimur remissionem peccatorum propter Christum et quod sola fide iustificemur, hoc est ex iniustis iusti efficiamur et regeneremur." — Die **ältere lutherische Dogmatik** trennte die im Glauben gelegenen Elemente, „notitia, assensus, fiducia," zu stark von einander und gab dem intellektuellen Bestandteil ein gewisses Uebergewicht. Umgekehrt hat man in der **neueren Theologie** vielfach einseitig das Gefühl und Willenselement auf Kosten der gläubigen Erkenntnis betont.

In allseitiger Zusammenfassung der verschiedenen Elemente des Glaubens wird man ihm die Definition geben dürfen: **Der Glaube ist die gottgewirkte Rezeptivität, welche die Heilsgaben Gottes hinnimmt und ihnen die Kraft zu sittlicher Aktivität entnimmt. Der Glaube schließt in sich: eine bewußte Heilserkenntnis wie eine persönliche und vertrauensvolle Hingabe an das Heil in Christus.**

III.

Das ewige Leben.

Das neue zeitliche Leben geht in das ewige über. Charakteristisch für die christliche Lebensauffassung und Hoffnung ist die **enge Verbindung von Geschichte und Ewigkeit, von Gegenwart und Zukunft.** Die christliche Gewißheit einer ewigen Vollendung ruht für den Christen auf seiner Verbundenheit mit dem lebendigen Gott, dem erhöhten Christus und den von ihm schon jetzt empfangenen Heilsgaben. Die Vergebung der Sünden hat den Christen von der Ursache alles Sterbens, der Sünde, befreit. Das neue zeitliche Leben, das bis zur „unio mystica" führte, ist Verbundenheit mit dem Gott, der von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit lebt und darum auch die Seinen an dieser Ewigkeit teilnehmen läßt. Es handelt sich um Güter, die sich nicht lassen verzehren „wie irdisch Reichtum tut." Auch die Kirche als Stätte göttlichen Geistes ist eine Schöpfung, die so wenig untergehen kann, wie dieser Geist selbst. Auf der andern Seite aber trägt das neue zeitliche Leben des Menschen so viel Vergänglichkeit, Unvollendetheit, Unvollkommenheit an sich, daß es einer Vollendung, Reinigung, Umgestaltung bedarf. Die Kirche ist in dem Maß noch von fremdartigen Bestandteilen durchzogen, daß sie einer Herauskristallisierung ihres reinen inneren Wesens unter andern Lebensbedingungen bedarf. **Das neue Leben im einzelnen wie in der Kirche bedarf mithin einer ewigen Vollendung.** So weit diese in Kontinuität mit dem gegenwärtigen erfolgt, hat der Christ eine unmittelbare Gewißheit und Erfahrung von ihr; so weit sie aber etwas völlig Anderes und Neues bringt, kann der Christ sie nur ahnen und auf das Wort der Schrift trauen. Dieses aber bewegt sich selbst zu einem guten Teil in der Bildrede, sodaß wir öfter auch hier, wie „durch einen Spiegel in einem dunklen Wort sehen." Wir werden darum gut tuen an einer Reihe von Punkten uns mit der Wiedergabe des biblischen Zeugnisses zu begnügen. **Die dogmatische Ausführung hat sich in der Eschatologie auf die klar erfaßbaren, für das Heil in Christo bedeutsamen Tatbestände zu beschränken.** Daneben mag sich die fromme Spekulation, so weit sie wirklich fromm ist und keine Grundwahrheiten des Glaubens gefährdet, in weiterer Ausmalung ergehen.

Während der **Tod** für den Nichtchristen den Charakter der Sündenstrafe und der Irrationalität trägt (vergleiche die Ausführungen in dem Artikel über die Sünde und den ausführlichen Artikel über den Tod in dieser Zeitschrift), wird er für den Christen insofern zur Erlösung, als er ihm mit seinem irdischen Leib auch die sein neues Leben hemmenden Beziehungen zur sündigen Welt nimmt. Auch der Christ empfindet, sonderlich im Moment des Eintrittes, den Tod nicht immer als Erlösung. Das hängt einmal mit

leiblichen Komplikationen zusammen, welche den Durchbruch des inneren geistigen Lebensgefühles hemmen. Es ist aber auch in der Tatsache begründet, daß auch im Christen noch Sünde und Weltverpflochtenheit vorhanden bleiben.

Der Christ wird auch im Tod durch Gottes Allmacht in der Identität und Individualität seines Lebens erhalten. Der völlig äußere Zusammenbruch zieht die innere Vernichtung nicht nach sich. Infolgedessen tritt für den Christen sogleich nach dem Tod ein Daheimsein im Paradies und damit eine Gewißheit über sein ewiges Schicksal ein. **Er wird selig** (Luk. 23, 43; Hebr. 12, 23; 2. Kor. 5, 8; Phil. 1, 23; Apok. 7, 9 ff.). Sofern das geschichtliche Leben auch in das jenseitige hinüberwirkt — das ist die Meinung der Offenbarung — wird dem einzelnen Christen sein Zustand zwischen seinem Tod und dem allgemeinen Gericht und Auferstung als ein **Zwischenzustand** erscheinen. Ueber seine näheren Formen sind die verschiedensten Hypothesen im Anschluß an die unsichere Auslegung verschiedener Schriftworte aufgestellt worden. Die einen verstehen ihn schlafähnlich und rein seelisch, die andern mit einer Zwischenleiblichkeit und dann mit bewußter Aktivität ausgefüllt. Die einen verlegen in diesen Zwischenzustand eine allmähliche Ausscheidung der Sünde und eine positive Reifung, die andern dagegen — so Apologie VI — lassen durch den Tod eine plötzliche und allseitige Umwandlung vollzogen sein. Wir werden alle diese Fragen mit dogmatischer Sicherheit nicht beantworten können.

Gewisseren Boden betreten wir wieder mit der Erkenntnis, daß der Christ schon im Augenblick seines irdischen Anschlusses an **Christus prinzipiell dem Gericht entnommen ist** (Joh. 5, 24; Hebr. 9, 22) und darum nach dem Tod nicht mehr gerichtet wird. Auch das **jüngste Gericht** hat für ihn nur die Bedeutung diesen Tatbestand vor der ganzen Menschheit festzustellen. Darum erfolgt das Gericht auch nach einem für alle erkennbarem Maßstab, nämlich nach den — aus lebendigem Glauben herauswachsenden — guten Werken. Der Richter rechtfertigt selbst sein Urteil vor allen Menschen (Matth. 25, 31; 2. Kor. 5, 10; 1. Kor. 6, 5 ff.).

Mit diesem Gericht verbindet sich die **Auferweckung** (Apok. 4, 2; Röm. 8, 2). **Sie gibt dem Christen eine seiner alten Leiblichkeit ideal korrespondierende und eine seiner erneuerten Innerlichkeit ganz entsprechende individuelle äußere Organisation.** An eine stoffliche Identität des neuen Leibes mit dem irdischen Fleisch ist nicht zu denken, da es ein „geistlicher Leib" im Gegensatz zum „seelischen Leib" mit Fleisch und Blut sein wird. (1. Kor. 15, 35. 44. 50; 6, 13—14; Joh. 6, 63.) Am meisten schriftgemäß und zurückhaltend bekennt sich das Nizänum zu einer „resurrectio mortuorum," während das Athanasianum sagt „cum corporibus suis," und das Apostolikum

von einer „resurrectio carnis“ spricht, dessen derbmaterialistische Deutung Luther bestimmt abgelehnt hat. Von dogmatischer Bedeutung ist wesentlich die Feststellung, daß zwischen unserm gegenwärtigen Wesen mit Leib und Seele und dem zukünftigen sowohl eine Identität, die **uns** fortleben läßt, besteht, wie ein Unterschied, der zu dem Bekenntnis führt: Siehe es ist alles neu geworden.

Auf Tod, Zwischenzustand, Gericht, Auferweckung folgt die **ewige Seligkeit.** Ihr innerstes Wesen trägt religiös-christlichen Charakter. **Sie besteht in der ununterbrochenen und völlig ungehemmten Verkehrsgemeinschaft mit dem dreieinigen Gott** (Joh. 14, 3; 17, 24; Matth. 25, 34; Röm. 8, 17; 1. Kor. 13, 10). Als das höchste Gut im Unterschied zu allen relativen Gütern übersättigt diese Gemeinschaft nie. Man wird ihrer niemals überdrüssig, sondern stets befriedigt, aber doch immer wieder zu neuem Streben angeregt. Gott ist unerschöpflich und darum auch die Gemeinschaft mit ihm. Die Seligkeit wird darum niemals „langweilig,“ sondern regt zu immer neuer Rezeptivität und Aktivität an. Durch die gemeinsamen Beziehungen zu Gott vermittelt sich auch die **gemeinsame Beziehung der Menschen untereinander.** Rein irdische Beziehungen begründen den Tatbestand einer Gemeinschaft unter den Seligen nicht (Matth. 22, 30); sofern die Erdenverwandtschaft und Freundschaft aber durch Gott geheiligt und erneuert ist, macht sie auch ein Element der ewigen Seligkeit aus. — Objektive **Unterschiede und Stufen** in der Seligkeit bestehen nicht, da jeder in ihr vollbefriedigt ist und alles empfängt, wessen er zu seiner Beglückung bedarf. Wohl aber kann man auf Grund von Andeutungen in Schrift und Bekenntnis subjektive Stufen der Seligkeit vermuten. Je nach der — durch die individuelle Entwicklung bedingten — religiösen Rezeptivität wird das Maß der intellektuellen gefühlsmäßigen und willentlichen Aneignung Gottes verschieden sein. Ein Paulus und ein Luther werden dort oben — ihrer besonderen Leistung entsprechend — sich noch tiefer in Gott versenken können, als die gewöhnlichen Christen. Aber doch wird jeder soviel empfangen, daß er vollkommen selig ist. (Matth. 25, 21—28; Luk. 19, 17—24; 2. Kor. 9, 6; 1. Kor. 3, 8; Apologie: „bona opera mereantur alia praemia corporalia et spiritualia et gradus praemiorum.“)

Die „Religion Jesu."

Von Professor Dr. W. Baur.

II.

Im einzelnen.

Wir werden gut tun, uns in dieser Abhandlung an ein bestimmtes Schema zu halten, das aber so beschaffen sein muß, daß der Sache, der es dienen soll, möglichst wenig Gewalt angetan wird. Vielleicht entspricht das Folgende allen billigen Anforderungen: Jesus und die Schrift; Jesus und Gott; Jesus und die Engelwelt; Jesus und die Menschen; Jesus und das Himmelreich; Jesus und die Zukunft.

1. Jesus und die Schrift.

Aus der Bergpredigt erfahren wir, daß Jesus erklärte, seine Mission bestehe in der Erfüllung von Gesetz und Propheten; stand er über der heiligen Schrift seines Volkes? Nicht gerade; denn er stand, er lebte in ihr. Man denke vor allem an die synoptischen Evangelien. Greifen wir einige Beispiele heraus! Die Predigt in Nazareth (Sondergut des Lukas) gründet sich auf alte Prophetenworte, und indem Jesus erklärte, diese Schrift sei nunmehr erfüllt, so geht daraus hervor, daß er an die Möglichkeit der Prophetie und an den Tatbeweis der wahren glaubte. Aus Hosea zitiert Jesus: „Ich habe Wohlgefallen an Barmherzigkeit und nicht an Opfer." Die Religion ist Sache des Lebens, der alltäglichen Uebung, und nicht des Ritus (allein oder vorwiegend). Aus Jesajas: „Dies Volk naht sich mir mit dem Mund . . . . sie lehren solche Lehren, die nichts denn Menschengebote sind." Die Religion ist Herzensreligion, wenn sie wahr sein soll; sie verdrängt nicht Gottes Wort durch Menschenlehre. Wiederum aus Jesajas: „Mit den Ohren werdet ihr hören und werdet es nicht verstehen." Wer nicht hören mag, den trifft das Gericht der Verstockung.

Wo Jesus von der Ehe redet, da zitiert er: „Darum wird ein Mensch Vater und Mutter verlassen" usw. Als die Kinder ihm zujubelten, verteidigt er sie mit dem Spruch: „Aus dem Mund der Unmündigen" usw. Das Fortleben nach dem Tod, beziehungsweise die Auferstehung folgert er aus der Redensart von dem Gott Abrahams, Isaaks und Jakobs. Die Pharisäer bringt er in Verwirrung, indem er sie aufgrund eines Psalmworts fragt: „Wie nennt ihn (den Messias) David im Geist einen Herrn . . . . wie ist er denn nun sein Sohn?" Ein Psalmwort: „Mein Gott, mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen?" muß ihm herhalten, als er in seiner tiefsten Not nach einem passenden Ausdruck für sein Gefühl gerungen, und mit einem Psalmwort auf den Lippen ist er verschieden.

Je näher das Ende rückt, um so häufiger die Zitate. Mit sicherem Griffe wählt Jesus immer das Richtige und Passende, das Packende und Treffende, das Ueberraschende. Fast zahllos sind die Gedanken, die sich im Alten Testament nachweisen lassen, und in die Augen springend die Hinweisungen auf Geschichten und Personen, die dem Leser der jüdischen Bibel von klein auf bekannt waren. Dabei werden alle Teile derselben benützt, das Gesetz, die Propheten und die Psalmen.

Es ist Jesu feste Ueberzeugung, daß die Schrift erfüllt werden muß und wird; er ist bereit, um dessetwillen auch sein Leben hinzugeben. So ist er selbst ein rechter Schriftgelehrter, zum Himmelreich gelehrt. Der Punkt, um den sich Gesetz und Prophetie drehen, ist dieser: Man tue den andern gegenüber das, von dem man wünscht, daß sie es uns tun möchten, und man tue es so, wie man es für sich selbst wünscht, nämlich, daß es zum Segen, zum Guten ausschlage. Die heilige Schrift will unser wahres Wohl befördern, nicht ein eingebildetes.

Dabei ist zu beachten, daß Jesus der Schrift gegenüber einen sehr freien Standpunkt einnimmt. „Wisset ihr nicht, wes Geistes ihr seid?", oder, wem diese Frage nicht sicher genug bezeugt erscheint, der sei auf das: „Er bedrohte sie" verwiesen, das doch etwas ähnliches ausdrückt. Das Gesetz tötet, das Evangelium will erretten. Wahrlich, hier ist mehr als Salomo; hier ist der, der auch größer ist als der Tempel. So hat sich Jesus ohne Furcht vor dem Vorwurf der Verachtung des Tempels, ohne Sorge, dem berühmten Salomo nahezutreten oder dem gewaltigen Elias, ohne sich Gedanken darüber zu machen, daß man ihn der Uebertretung des Gesetzes oder des Widerspruches einem Gottesmann und Nationalhelden wie Moses gegenüber verdächtigen könnte — er hat sich, sagen wir, über all diese Großen erhaben gefühlt und diesem Gefühl auch fröhlich, frisch und wie selbstverständlich den passenden Ausdruck gegeben. Wir sehen hier aber auch, wie schwierig es ist, von der „Religion" Jesu zu reden, ohne die uns damit gesetzte Schranke zu überschreiten.

Aber dies können und müssen wir sagen: Jesus war ganz an die Schrift gebunden, und doch frei; er konnte ohne das Wort Gottes nicht leben (cf. „Der Mensch lebt nicht vom Brot allein" usw.), sprechen und handeln, empfand dies aber nicht als eine Last, eine Schranke, einen Zwang, sondern als eine Lust, als eine Uebung der Freiheit, als eine Gelegenheit zu immer herrlicherer Entfaltung seiner eigenen Persönlichkeit, und so hat er auch die Versuchung mit der Schrift besiegt. Stand nun Jesus so zum Worte Gottes, wie stand er dann zu Gott selbst, das heißt, was sagte er von Gott selbst?

2. Jesu Aussagen über Gott.

Man sagt, Jesus habe keine Theologie, keine Dogmatik gehabt; das ist richtig, wenn man diese Ausdrücke in ihrem engeren, dem fachmännischen Sinne versteht. Denkt man aber unter Theologie an eine (wie immer kurz gefaßte, populäre) Lehre von Gott und unter Dogma an eine irgendwie formulierte, glaubensmäßige Ueberzeugung, so liegt auf der Hand, daß es nur ein Wortstreit ist, diese Dinge ihm abzusprechen. Jesus hat eine ganz bestimmte Meinung von Gott gehabt und er hat sie uns nicht vorenthalten.

Der Name, den er Gott beilegt, ist Vater (und Herr Himmels und der Erden). Er nennt ihn bald seinen, bald „euren" Vater; das ist ein beachtenswerter Wechsel im Fürwort; er steht Gott doch ganz anders gegenüber als die Jünger. Gott ist der Vater im Himmel und wohnt im Verborgenen; über sein Wesen spekuliert er nicht. Er ist sittlich vollkommen und gerecht; daß Gott Persönlichkeit sei, steht Jesu also fest. Die Menschen, die ihm nacheifern, sind seine Kinder, das heißt diese vor allen andern; denn im Grunde sind alle Menschen seine Kinder, und seine Güte erstreckt sich über alle. Er weiß, was sie bedürfen, und erhört ihre Gebete. Gott sorgt für alle, auch für die Tiere, und erst recht für alle Menschen, die guten und die bösen, bis ins Kleinste hinein und bis zum Kleinsten hin. Kein Menschenkind, auch das kleinste nicht, soll verloren gehen.

Gott, der die Sünde zuläßt (Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn), ist barmherzig und vergibt die Sünden; er sieht, was allen andern verborgen, die geheimsten Taten und die verborgenen Wurzeln unsers Tuns. Darum ist er der gerechte Vergelter. Weil nun Gott nicht ungerecht handelt, darum ist seine Vergebung sittlich bedingt. Dabei ist er zu fürchten als der, der Leib und Seele der Menschen in der Feuerhölle verderben kann.

Gott ist ein einiger Gott (Monotheismus) und aller Menschen und Dinge Schöpfer; denn, wenn Jesus von ihm als dem spricht, der im Anfang die Menschen schuf, so geht daraus hervor, daß er das Wort kannte und für wahr hielt: „Am Anfang schuf Gott" usw. Ihm sind alle Dinge möglich. Sein Dienst und Mammonsdienst schließen sich gegenseitig aus. Er ist der einzig Gute und allein anbetungswürdig. Er kann geschaut werden, doch nur von denen, die reines Herzens sind, und auch von denen erst in der nicht näher bezeichneten Zukunft.

Der Geist Gottes, von Jesus den Jüngern gegenüber als „Eures Vaters Geist" benannt, redet aus ihrem Munde, wenn sie sich des Glaubens halber verantworten müssen; es gibt also eine Inspiration (der Personen). Dieser Geist ist ein solcher der Heiligkeit, dessen Lästerung die eine Sünde ist, die nicht vergeben wird.

Es gibt eine spezielle Gottesoffenbarung, nämlich die betreffs Jesu als des Messias (und Sohnes Gottes: aber das führt wieder über Jesu „Religion" hinaus), und Gott hat ein Reich, das Reich Gottes oder des Himmels. Die Ehrenplätze in diesem Reich werden nur von Gott vergeben, der auch allein weiß, wann das Weltende kommt. In seiner Kraft findet die Auferstehung statt, und das Fortleben nach dem Tod knüpft Jesus genau mit der Tatsache zusammen, daß Gott ein Gott der Lebendigen ist: „Vor ihm leben sie alle."

3. Jesus und die Engelwelt.

In einer ernsten Stunde nennt Jesus den ihm so nahe stehenden Petrus „Satan." Der Lieblingsjünger wurde dem Meister zu einem „scandalon." Man könnte das Wort Satan hier bildlich verstehen; aber in der Aussendungsrede (Matthäus, andeutungsweise auch die andern) gibt Jesus den Jüngern den Auftrag: „Treibet die Dämonen aus." Wir sehen also, daß er an die Existenz böser Geister, an Besessenheit und deren Heilung durch Austreibung glaubte. Man denke an das Wort: „So ich aber die Dämonen durch Beelzebub austreibe." Ferner spricht Jesus von unreinen Geistern und schließt sogar von dem Austreiben der Dämonen auf die Gegenwart des Reiches Gottes.

In der Auslegung des Gleichnisses vom Sämann spricht er von dem Kommen des „Argen" und in der des Gleichnisses vom Unkraut unter dem Weizen nennt er den Feind, der die Kinder der Bosheit „sät," Diabolos. Von ihm, dem Satan, sagt er nach der frohen Rückkehr der Siebenzig: „Ich sah wohl den Satanas vom Himmel fallen." Ein merkwürdiges Wort, das unmöglich erfunden sein kann; es bezeugt den Teufel als eine gefallene Größe, und das zu einer Stunde, da Jesus, wie es scheint, auf einem Höhepunkt seines Lebens stand.

Auf der andern Seite kennt Jesus gute Geister, die Engel. Von den Kindern sagt er: „Ihre Engel im Himmel sehen allezeit das Angesicht meines Vaters im Himmel." Es gibt also, nach Jesu Wort, Schutzengel der (kindlichen) Personen, und das kindliche Wesen steht in enger Verbindung mit dem göttlichen.

Die Engel nehmen an der Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts in der Richtung auf das Reich Gottes innigen Anteil; sie freuen sich über einen jeden bußfertigen Sünder und am Ende unsers Zeitlaufs werden sie dem Weltenrichter die Scheidung zwischen Gut und Böse herbeiführen helfen.

4. Jesus und die Menschen.

Der besseren Uebersicht halber unterscheiden wir hier zwischen den Individuen und den sozialen Gebilden; in Wirklichkeit gehört beides natürlich immer zusammen; auch handelt es sich uns mehr

um das Dogmatische als das Ethische, wenn diese modernen Ausdrücke überhaupt am Platz sind. Wir fragen also zunächst: Wie dachte Jesus von den Menschen? (den Individuen in sittlich-religiöser Beziehung).

a. Jesus und die Individuen.

Es muß zuerst hervorgehoben werden, daß Jesus in einem besonders innigen Verhältnis zu den Kindern stand, er, der nie verheiratet war, der sich um des Himmelreichs willen selbst „verschnitten" hatte. Die Kinder, die man zu ihm brachte, nimmt er an sein Herz, er spricht ihnen das Himmelreich zu und segnet sie. Ein Kind stellt er seinen Jüngern vor, um ihnen klar zu machen, worin die Größe im Himmelreich bestehe, und er spricht zu ihnen von dem schrecklichen Gericht, das auf den warte, der einen an ihn gläubig gewordenen „Kleinsten" ärgere. Diese Wendung führt natürlich wieder über Jesu Religion hinaus; es bleibt aber der Gedanke übrig, daß Jesus im Kindeswesen das Menschenwesen in verhältnismäßiger Reinheit dargestellt findet. Der Vater im Himmel selbst will nicht, daß „jemand von diesen Kleinen verloren werde." Das Kindliche spielt in Jesu Religion eine hervorragende Rolle. Noch im Angesicht des Todes zitiert er: „Aus dem Munde der Unmündigen und Säuglinge hast du Lob zugerichtet."

Eng zusammen mit der Kindesgüte steht die Vatergüte; es ist beachtenswert, daß Jesus, da er auf sie verweist, die beiläufige Bemerkung von der menschlichen Schlechtigkeit macht: „Ihr, die ihr doch arg seid" usw. Das Beiläufige nimmt dem Wort nichts von seiner Schärfe; es ist ganz selbstverständlich so, daß die Menschen arg sind, und in der Lukasstelle vom Turm zu Siloah setzt Jesus die Tatsache der menschlichen Sündhaftigkeit ohne weiteres voraus: „So ihr euch nicht bessert." Aber Jesu Religion macht ihn weder zum blinden Optimisten noch zum verzweifelnden Pessimisten. Kann man uns mehr im Bausch und Bogen verdammen? Und kann man uns ein größeres Lob spenden, wenn Jesus keinen Anstand nimmt, von der den menschlichen Vätern möglichen Güte aus das Gespräch auf die göttliche Vatergüte zu lenken? Dabei muß man bedenken, daß es sich bei uns Menschen hier doch um eine Sache handelt, die mit dem Geschlechtsleben zu tun hat.

Daß Jesus genau wußte, wie schlecht wir sind, geht sofort aus seinem Verlangen hervor: „Tut Buße." Wir müssen unsern Sinn gründlich ändern, besonders mit Bezug auf das Reich Gottes, davon später. Unser Leib muß in strenger Zucht gehalten werden: Warum denn? Wegen unsrer körperlichen Gesundheit und Schönheit? Nein, wegen unsrer Sündhaftigkeit. Das Herz muß man in Zucht nehmen; denn aus dem Herzen kommt das Böse. Jesus weiß, daß die menschliche Rachsucht das Gebot primitiver Gerechtigkeit:

„Auge um Auge, Zahn um Zahn" (nicht Auge um Zahn usw.) fortgehends zu ihrer Rechtfertigung verdreht. Er weist auf den Eid hin, um uns an unsre Verkehrtheit zu erinnern, und auf die mosaische Erlaubnis zur Ehescheidung, um hinzuzusetzen, so sei es von Anfang an nicht gewesen. Er spricht von der Notwendigkeit, einander die Sünden zu vergeben, wie es Gott auch tue; spricht von Feindschaft und Feindesliebe; von der Notwendigkeit der Einfalt (Kindlichkeit) und von der Unmöglichkeit, zugleich Gott und dem Mammon zu dienen (also hat er doch die Meinung dazu, ja den praktischen Versuch im Auge); man solle einander nicht gegenseitig richten und verdammen.

Uebrigens ist ein Unterschied im Sündigen, und so spricht Jesus von guten und bösen Menschen, von gutem Samen und Unkrautsamen, von den Kindern des Reichs und denen der Bosheit. Aergernis muß ja kommen und die Menschenseelen sind alle Gott verschuldet; darum müssen alle Buße tun und ihr sinnlich-selbstsüchtiges Leben dran geben, um das wahre Leben zu finden. Aber so wenig wie das Aergernis gerade durch diesen oder jenen kommen muß, ebenso wenig ist auch jeder geneigt Buße zu tun; ja, man kann sein Herz verstocken, wie es auf der andern Seite Menschen gibt, die sich um des Himmelreiches willen die größten persönlichen Opfer auflegen. Es ist einfach eine Tatsache, daß nur wenige auf dem Weg wandeln, der zum Leben führt. Ohne Glauben gibt es keine Hilfe; wer sich verstockt, geht zugrunde. So können solche, die zuerst berufen sind, ganz ans Ende kommen, und Spätberufene können ihre Stelle einnehmen.

Wenn Jesus davor warnt, die Perlen vor die Säue zu werfen, so ist vorausgesetzt, daß das Böse in manchen Menschen eine besonders gefährliche Macht geworden ist, und ganz schlimm steht es um die Menschen, die das von Gott uns eingepflanzte und geschenkte Licht (Vernunft und Offenbarung) durch eigene Schuld verderben. Gerade auf dem religiösen Gebiet ist die Sünde und das Verderben in ihrer schimmsten Gestalt anzutreffen, so daß Jesu öffentliche Sünder lieber sind als verheuchelte; von jenen steht noch eher Besserung zu erhoffen, als von diesen.

Dem allem gegenüber bleibt wahr, daß der Mensch mehr wert ist, als die ganze Welt; er lebt nicht vom Brot allein, sondern recht eigentlich von Gottes Wort; er steht hoch über den Tieren. Das von Gott gegebene und enthaltene Leben ist mehr als die Speise und selbst der vergängliche Menschenleib mehr als die Kleidung. Das menschliche Leben soll daher auch zu Gottes Ehre verwendet werden; man soll gute Werke tun, doch nicht zum eigenen Ruhm, sondern so daß Gott von den Menschen geehrt wird.

b. Jesus und die sozialen Gebilde.

Jesus und die Ehe. Jesus führt den auf die Erhaltung der Gattung gerichteten Trieb auf die göttliche Schöpfung zurück, ebenso seine Regelung auf die göttliche Einsetzung der Ehe. Von hier aus argumentiert er für die Unverletzlichkeit der monogamischen Ehe: „Was Gott zusammengefügt hat, soll der Mensch nicht scheiden." Um des bösen Herzens willen verwirft Jesus den mosaischen Scheidebrief nicht; wohl aber die Wiederverehelichung der Geschiedenen.

Jesus und die Obrigkeit. Wir stellen hier das bekannte Wort an die Spitze: „Gebet dem Kaiser" usw.; hiermit ist der Standpunkt Jesu ein für allemal festgestellt. Beide Gebiete sind zu trennen: Dem Kaiser gehört das Geld; denn die Autorität und die Macht des Staates garantiert ja unsre Finanzwirtschaft. Dem Staat gehört unser irdisches Leben; denn er bietet uns die Möglichkeit, es in geregelten Bahnen zu entwickeln. Dagegen gehört Gott unsre Persönlichkeit, insofern darin unsre ewige Bestimmung zum Ausdruck kommt; denn nur in Gemeinschaft mit dem ewigen Gott vermögen wir aufgrund unsers irdischen Daseins ewige Werte zu schaffen. Wir gehorchen aber dem Staat um Gottes willen; darin liegt die Kraft unsrer Vaterlandsliebe, aber auch ihre einzig vernünftige Schranke.

Daß Jesus weit davon entfernt war, die Obrigkeit, den Staat zu vergöttern, wie das oft genug ein selbstsüchtiger, also falscher Patriotismus tut, geht aus der Bezeichnung des Herodes, seines „Landesvaters," als eines Fuchses hervor. Zugleich ersehen wir aus dem Zusammenhang, wie unentwegt Jesus an seiner Lebensaufgabe festhielt; keine Macht der Welt konnte ihn daran irremachen, auch die Obrigkeit nicht.

„Laß die Toten ihre Toten begraben": War Jesu Religion kulturfeindlich? Lukas hat das Beispiel von dem Mann, der erst noch einen Abschied machen wollte, dem aber Jesus das Wort entgegenhält: „Wer seine Hand an den Pflug legt" usw. Jesu Religion war kein Kompromiß mit der Welt; kulturfeindlich nur insofern, als die Kultur sündhaft affiziert ist. In den angeführten Fällen war es nötig, den Rekruten einen Eindruck von der großen Scheidung zu vermitteln, die Jesu Nachfolge verlangte.

Der kirchlichen Obrigkeit leistete er den zu erwartenden Gehorsam; doch ist zu beachten, daß er sich ihr gegenüber innerlich frei und ungebunden fühlte. Er entrichtete die jährliche Tempelsteuer, „auf daß wir sie nicht ärgern." Dem Buchstaben des Gesetzes nach war Jesus wie jeder Israelite dazu verpflichtet, und die Steuerbeamten hatten dem Anschein nach einen ziemlichen Respekt vor ihm; beides wird er inbetracht gezogen haben.

Jesus erkennt die Amtsgewalt der Priester an, ebenso wie die

Autorität der zurechtbestehenden gesetzlichen Vorschriften: „Gehe hin und zeige dich den Priestern." Selbst der besonderen Stellung des Judenvolkes den Heiden gegenüber trägt er Rechnung; man denke an den Gebrauch des Wortes „Hunde" in der Perikope von dem kanaanäischen Weiblein. Diesem Volk ist Gottes Wort anvertraut; darum soll man tun, was die auf Moses Stuhl sitzenden Schriftgelehrten und Pharisäer sagen, daß man halten soll; freilich ihrem Beispiel, ihrem ärgerlichen Leben, soll man nicht folgen.

Das 23. Kapitel des Matthäus-Evangeliums zeigt, wie Jesus die Repräsentanten der kirchlichen Obrigkeit auf das allerschärfste anfaßt. Woher diese Stellung? Es war eine entartete Theologie und eine verknöcherte Religiosität, der er sich gegenüber sah. Mit der Entrüstung einer Frömmigkeit, die ihrer Wahrheit sich unmittelbar bewußt war, und mit dem auf Gott gerichteten Blick einer Theologie, die weder aus menschlicher Schulweisheit stammte, noch durch Streben nach Menschengunst verunreinigt war, griff Jesus seine Gegner ohne Scheu gerade an jenen Stellen an, die nach ihrer eigenen und des Volkes Meinung ihre stärksten waren. Er hielt ihnen einen Spiegel ihrer Heuchelei, Habgier, Ehrsucht, ihrer Sophistereien vor und zeigt ihnen, wie sie dadurch bei all ihrer umständlichen und doch so kleinlichen Propaganda die eigene Seele wie die Seelen ihrer Anhänger auf das Schwerste gefährdeten. Mit starken Worten weist er auf ihre furchtbare Verantwortung, auf ihre Schuld am kommenden Gottesgericht hin. In Jesu religiösen Anschauungen steckt eine gewaltige reformatorische Kraft.

Dem ganzen praktischen Kirchenwesen seiner Zeit gegenüber betont Jesus immer wieder das ursprünglich Einfache, das prinzipiell Wichtige. Der Sabbath ist um des Menschen willen eingesetzt; das Gesetz ist als Ausdruck des heiligen Liebeswillen Gottes dem von Gott geschaffenen Menschenwesen durchaus angepaßt und läßt sich auf das Verlangen zurückführen: Ihr sollt Gott über alles und den Nächsten wie euch selbst lieben; das macht aller Jesuiterei und Kasuistik ein Ende. Fasten, Beten und Almosengeben haben ihre notwendige Stelle in der praktischen Frömmigkeit, sind aber leere Formen und seelengefährlich, wenn sie nicht aus der lebendigen Beziehung des Herzens auf Gott herauswachsen. Sobald diese Dinge Gegenstand der kirchlichen Gesetzgebung werden, droht die Gefahr des Legalismus. Was der Natur der Sache nach Ausfluß der religiösen Grundstimmung sein muß, das wird „mitgemacht," um das Lob der Loyalität zu erhalten. Und dann meint man noch, auf diese Weise das Reich Gottes zu „bauen."

EDITORIALS

THE MINISTER AND THE APOSTLES' CREED

Some of our younger clergy have considerable difficulty with the Apostles' Creed; and the same may be said of the younger—and some of the older—men in other communions. The age is critical and it would be strange indeed if those whose convictions are still in a state of flux could escape the influence of their environment. To go a step further, will not even older men often feel compelled to revise the formulations of their faith in the light of new attitudes? The modern mind is influenced by two considerations in its views about religion, one scientific and the other practical. Science has taught us the continuity of law in every field of observation. Nature's laws are in unbroken operation everywhere, and always have been. And, secondly, every interest of human life must today undergo the pragmatic test; the tree must be judged by its fruits. What has no bearing on life's real problems is discarded. The scientific spirit has no place for the miraculous; the pragmatic will not waste time on metaphysics. The religious interests of the time are wholly ethical. The advocates of the social gospel treat dogmatics as a subject of value only to the antiquarian.

If we have characterized the trend of the times correctly, it is obvious that *creeds* must stand low in the market today. And this disparaging attitude to creeds is not confined to the highly metaphysical confessions of the Greek church fathers. It applies equally even to the Apostles' Creed, the only one that in a manner still is the common bond of all churches. The Apostles' Creed—aside from its Trinitarian faith—has little that could be called metaphysical.

Still it is under fire. Long before American theologians turned their guns on it, Harnack, of the university of Berlin, held his lectures on the "Essence of Christianity" (in 1899-1900). In these lectures he proposed to substitute his own creed for the Apostles'. What kind of creed this was may be judged from the astounding declaration he made, that *the Son had no place in the gospel,* only the Father. The Son was only the revealer of the Father's love and the inspiring example from whom we learn to have love for the neighbor and victorious trust in God ourselves. Metaphysical questions and miracles, performed either by Jesus or on his person, were

cast off as relics of an unscientific age. Instead, he proposed to put a heavy emphasis on the ethical perfections of Jesus ("whose whole life was love only" etc.). We were to have the religion *of* Jesus, not the religion *about* Jesus. Harnack's lectures created a sensation; in book form they went through many editions. But his new creed was not adopted by any church.

Since then we have gone through the same process in America. Shailer Mathews and H. E. Fosdick have suggested new creeds, which are largely along the lines of Harnack's own production. They eliminate the miraculous and metaphysical and stress the ethical. No church has so far felt inclined to give them a place in its "confessional paragraphs." The Modernists themselves admit that it will be impossible to formulate a creed that would be acceptable to all. Ours seems to be no creed-making age. We may revise or restate them, but our revisions commend themselves only to the respective theologians and their followers; on the church at large they make no impression. Recently Calkins proposed a creed that for simplicity and brevity could hardly be surpassed. It was this that *"in Christ God finds us and in Christ we find him."* He meant that God is like Christ and that Christ is the way to God. True enough, but who would substitute such a bald, logical statement for the ponderous, triumphant, throbbing facts of the old creed!

We have in the Apostles' Creed an enumeration of facts and hardly any interpretation of these facts, that is, hardly any doctrines; for instance, no doctrine of the atonement. We indeed have the same emphasis on the suffering, death and resurrection of Christ that we find in the teaching of the apostles. But we have a faith resting on *facts*. If one does not believe in these facts, if one considers some of them mythological (the virgin birth), others as of symbolical value only (the resurrection, ascension, etc.), a dilemma will doubtless have been created.

What will the ministers have to do in such a case, and what attitude will the church take? If the minister takes a radical position and refuses to accept the creed because he disagrees with some of its elements, he will have shut the door for himself to the evangelical ministry. If, however, he only professes uncertainty on some points or on the vital importance of some points, we don't see why then either he himself should stay away or the church should keep him out. This writer has for many years wished the "descensus ad inferos" was not in the creed. It is neither a clear item of doctrine, nor vital, nor sufficiently warranted in scripture. But that has not driven him out of the church nor kept him from using the creed. When reciting it he has made for himself a kind of mental reservation on this particular point. Still the creed that we call

the Apostles', is the creed of *the church,* not of the individual minister. Who am I that I should try to impose my own revised, reduced and modernized creed upon a helpless congregation! For ministers to omit the creed in public service, or at baptism, or to substitute for it their own up-to-the-minute production, seems to us the height of spiritual presumption.

It can be seen clearly that for our church, too, the days of a uniform orthodoxy are passing. The number of those who are affected by the modern spirit is comparatively small but it is bound to grow. And it is going to grow among those who are students, not practical pastors only. In other words, the intellectually alert are most apt to deviate into ways that seem to the fathers ways of error. We cannot enforce uniformity by a show of authority. We shall need tolerance, moderation, wisdom. Most of us will want to abide by the faith of the fathers and will try hard to keep the church there. Let us examine the foundations of our faith in the light of new truth and trust to the Spirit to guide us in a new age as he has in the simpler days of the past.

„Tritt keck auf, tu's Maul auf, hör bald auf!"

So sagt Luther zu dem Prediger, der im Begriff ist, die Kanzel zu besteigen. Wir wollen uns heute mit dem ersten Punkt beschäftigen, mit dem „Tritt keck auf!" Der Prediger muß Vertrauen haben in seine Fähigkeit, auf der Kanzel seiner Aufgabe gerecht zu werden. Es ziemt ihm nicht, sich von allerhand schreckhaften Gedanken so beeinflussen zu lassen, daß es ihm geht wie Simson, da ihm das Haupthaar geschoren war: seine Kraft war von ihm gewichen. Er muß **Selbstvertrauen** haben. Zwar heißt es in der Schrift: „Wehe dem, der Fleisch für seinen Arm hält!" und ebenso, daß es „besser ist auf den Herrn vertrauen und sich nicht verlassen auf Menschen," auch nicht auf sich selbst. Aber so ist das „Selbstvertrauen" nicht gemeint. Es soll ruhen auf dem Bewußtsein, daß uns Gott an diese Stelle gesetzt hat, daß wir es mit seinem Evangelium zu tun haben, und daß wir uns mit der Predigt ehrliche Mühe gegeben haben. Wenn diese Voraussetzungen zutreffen, so darf der Prediger das Vertrauen zu sich selbst haben, daß Gott ihm beistehen wird.

Wir haben die Beobachtung gemacht, daß im Punkte des Selbstvertrauens der amerikanische Prediger in der Regel vor dem deutschen etwas voraus hat. Er ist mit einem reichlicheren Maße dieses Artikels ausgestattet, teils weil Selbstvertrauen ein natürliches Erbteil des landläufigen Optimismus ist und teils weil im allgemeinen der Amerikaner eine größere Redefertigkeit hat als der etwas schwerfällige Deutsche.

Selbstvertrauen allein macht natürlich nicht den tüchtigen und wirksamen Kanzelredner. Es muß einer etwas Ordentliches zu sagen haben, sonst wird auch der verwegenste Schwätzer bald am Ende seines Einflusses sein. Aber es ist ein höchst wichtiger psychologischer Faktor. Die Psyche dessen, den die Natur zum Reden bestimmt hat, ist zart besaitet. Es kann irgend eine Kleinigkeit, eine Unpäßlichkeit oder ein unangenehmer Vorfall sie aus dem Gleichgewicht bringen. Derselbe Mann, der uns vielleicht früher begeisterte Anerkennung durch seinen Vortrag abgenötigt hatte, wird unter dem Einfluß seelischer Lähmung so jämmerlich sich durch seine halbe Stunde hindurcharbeiten, daß man zweifeln möchte, ob es denn wirklich derselbe Mann sei. Wir finden uns in dieser Einschätzung der psychologischen Verfassung des Redners in vollständiger Uebereinstimmung mit William Mathews, der in seinem mit Recht berühmten „Oratory and Orators" also sagt:

"We cannot conclude this chapter without reminding the student of oratory that there is no calling in which faith in one's self, so necessary to all successful exertions, is more necessary than in that of the orator. After he has made all possible preparation for a public effort, he should, as far as possible, dismiss all anxiety about the result. If,

instead of having this self-confidence, he distrusts his own powers, and becomes self-critical, acting continually as a spy upon himself, he will almost certainly be embarrassed and crippled in his speech, if he does not break down altogether. Suspicion here, as elsewhere, tends to beget the very evil that is deprecated. The mind is apt to avenge any distrust of its faithfulness. Time, practice, and patience only can give the perfect ease, coolness, and self-possession which are essential to perfect success,—that profound faith in one's abilities which acts as a charm upon all the powers of the mind,—as time only can bestow that practical instinct of skill which gives the intuitive law of success, and shows the only way to reach it."

Leute von nervösem Temperament geraten besonders oft in die Lage, in dieser Sache unangenehme Erfahrungen zu machen. In normaler Verfassung klimmen gerade sie zuweilen die Sprossen der Beredsamkeit hoch hinauf. Wenn aber eine Depression eintritt, so fühlen sie sich so gelähmt, daß die Kanzel ihnen in solchen Augenblicken eine wahre Marterstube wird. Einer unsrer Amtsbrüder machte in dieser Beziehung kürzlich eine Erfahrung, die allen ähnlich Behafteten von Interesse sein wird. Wir haben die Sache von ihm selbst, es ist also eine „wahre Geschichte."

Der Betreffende hat schon viel von ähnlichen Zuständen gelitten, in früheren Jahren freilich mehr als jetzt. Vor einigen Monaten stand er auf der Kanzel, wohl vorbereitet und in der Hoffnung, etwas Gutes zu leisten. Auf einmal fühlte er die innere Lähmung herankommen. Er versuchte sich ihrer mit aller Macht zu erwehren — umsonst! Wie sich die Fangarme des Oktopus unwiderstehlich nach seinem Opfer ausstrecken, bis sie ihm den Odem ausgedrückt haben, so unterlag er diesem unheimlichen, mysteriösen Einfluß. Die halbe Stunde der Predigt schien ihm eine Ewigkeit. Es war ein Gutes, daß er sich fleißig umgetan, auch einige treffende Geschichten gesammelt hatte. So kam er wenigstens ans Ende. Aber freiringen konnte seine Seele sich nicht, und als er schloß, war er förmlich in Schweiß gebadet. Wie ein Dieb stahl er sich nach Hause, und der ganze Sonntag war für ihn unter der Wolke. O, dachte er, noch ein paar mehr solcher Erfahrungen, und ich bin fertig!

Am Montag saß er in seiner Studierstube, seine Seele im Gebet ausschüttend. Da kommt seine Frau herein und teilt ihm mit, daß eben eine andre Frau aufgerufen und ihr mitgeteilt habe, daß niemals eine Predigt ihr und ihrem Mann solchen Eindruck gemacht habe, wie eben diese. Seine eigene Frau drückte sich ähnlich aus und sagte das gleiche von einer verheirateten Tochter. Es war Balsam auf seine wunde Seele. Wie dankerfüllt sank er vor dem Thron Gottes nieder, als ihn seine Frau verlassen! Und wie fest nahm er sich vor, in Zukunft keinen Zweifeln an seiner Predigertüchtigkeit mehr Raum zu lassen.

Bis jetzt — so hören wir von ihm — hat ihm das jedes Mal richtig geholfen. Das Mittel ist probat. Wer es braucht, der versuche es. Luther hat Recht: Tritt keck auf, und Gott wird dein Vertrauen nicht zuschanden werden lassen!

Einbinden des „Magazins."

Das Publishing House hat uns die Jahrgänge 1925 und 1926 schön eingebunden. Infolgedessen haben wir den Inhalt derselben fleißig durchgestöbert, oder doch einzelne Teile desselben. Wir waren erstaunt über die Gediegenheit mancher Artikel und dachten, wie manches doch denen verloren ginge, die die alten Hefte nicht mehr durchlesen, weil sie nicht zusammengebunden sind. Das Publishing House bindet die Hefte eines Jahrgangs zusammen **zum Preise von $1.50,** und hoffen wir, daß viele Leser von diesem Anerbieten Gebrauch machen; es wird sie nicht gereuen.

The Christian World

Religion and the Creation of a Better World *

Reprinted by permission of The Christian, Kansas City, July 21, 1927

Reinhold Niebuhr

While the church is very critical of war today, after the great war revealed the full horror of armed physical conflict, there is no indication that the church really knows what is involved in the elimination of war. It does not see the brutal realities of the economic struggle in which the nations are engaged. In America the church is doing practically nothing to teach the average American how dangerous to the peace of the world American pride and power are becoming. It is doing a little but not much more to destroy the race hatred which resides in every Nordic heart and which will finally imperil our relations with the orient. Of course a religion which can only see the fruits of sin and not its root is more or less useless.

We ought not to take for granted, however, that the easy optimism which characterizes contemporary religion is its permanent tendency. Religion at its best does sensitize the conscience and discovers to men's blind eyes hitherto tolerated vices. If religion in our day has not been exercising the function of encouraging men to repentance this has been partly due to its reaction against the extreme pessimism of the middle ages. Discovering the fallacy of the medieval conception of original sin, the modern church set up a dogma of progress, of almost automatic progress, as fallacious as the idea of human depravity. What we need among young Christians today, and it ought not to be impossible of achievement, is an attitude of wholesome realism which cannot be taken in by either a romantic optimism or a cynical pessimism. Human beings are not so far removed from the stone age as they had imagined, but they are making progress and there is no reason why, after we know all the facts, we should lose hope in them. But to hope without knowing all the facts is to mix illusion with hope. It is not impossible to overcome the fatuous optimism with which religion has become enmeshed.

Professor Whitehead makes the interesting observation that our present moral confusion is partly due to Protestantism's oversimplification of ethics. Any individual ethics is too simple for a social age. But the ethics of the modern church has been oversimplified beyond its individualism. It assumed that people were either good or bad, bad before their conversion and good after it. It was based on the belief that the moral good will which issues out of the religious experience would apply itself automatically to the world's problems. It did

---

*An excerpt from "Students and the Religion of Today," published by the Association Press, New York.

not realize that people may be very moral in one relationship and very immoral in another; that it is therefore necessary to develop a conscience for each moral problem.

If a man has been intemperate and learns to master his appetites through the power of his religion it does not follow that he will know how to be spiritual and ethical in his relations to men in his employ. Nor does it follow that he will know how to bring a sensitive conscience to bear upon the problems of his nation. Part of the cynicism of our day is due to the discovery that pious men can be very unethical. If the cynic draws the conclusion from such a phenomenon that piety has nothing to do with ethics, he is, however, very much mistaken. He has simply discovered a victim of an oversimplified ethics.

Wherever we trust religious good will to function without intelligent guidance it will inevitably apply itself to some very simple moral problem, where application is more or less automatic, and be applied nowhere else. There is a tendency to sacrifice all confidence in the ethical potency of religion as soon as this admission is made. That is simply a sign of intellectual immaturity. Men want to believe in all or nothing. Either religion is a magical panacea for all ills or all confidence in it is lost. We must learn to treat the major interests of men as we must learn to treat men. We must know how to be critical of their limitations without losing confidence in them.

Perhaps one further difficulty which men will encounter as they seek to make religion potent for the creation of a better world ought to be mentioned. Religion has a deep instinct for persuading men to seek their happiness in the inner kingdom of the soul in defiance of external circumstances. It teaches them to "be not anxious for tomorrow." It asks them to learn to be content whether they are abased or whether they abound. In short it helps them to transcend life's fortunes. That is a very noble quality in the life of faith but also a very dangerous one. It is particularly dangerous in an age in which men suffer from many social ills from which they might be emancipated by taking thought. It is the characteristic of religion which persuades cynics that all religion is otherworldly and that it deals with the proper way of dying rather than the right way of living. That is rather too simple an explanation.

Yet this note in the religious message easily lends itself to abuse and tempts religion into antisocial attitudes. When faced with the immutabilities of nature it is a more serviceable note than when man suffers from the ills which are inflicted upon him by the cruelty or indifference of his fellowmen. It is therefore necessary that all spiritually minded people who are intent upon building a better world keep a close watch upon this characteristic of faith, lest it betray them into premature contentments, and lest it be used to justify social conditions which ought to be changed.

It is not to be assumed that the task of building an ethical civilization depends altogether upon the reconstruction and the readjustment of religion to modern life and its ethical needs. There may be an ethical life without religion. But it may well be doubted whether

men of conscience will finally have either enough courage or enough imagination without the resources which religion supplies. To attempt to build an ethical civilization without a profound conviction that the universe itself guarantees the ultimate preservation of spiritual values usually means that the attempt will issue in despair. To try to build a world in which human beings will rust and love one another without a profound and religious insight into the essential beauty of human nature and without the will to trust people even beyond their immediate capacity to justify such trust means final defeat. What is needed is a robust faith which can maintain itself even after the worst is known.

To build a kingdom of God on earth is no easy task. The chief foes of the enterprise are those who think that task easy and those who think it impossible. Only a genuine religious faith, stripped of sentimentality but not delivered into the hands of pessimism, can finally accomplish the task. That is essentially the faith of Jesus, who saw the vision of the kingdom of God but knew that there was a cross for those who followed the vision.

The Most Hopeful Outlook

Reprinted by permission of The Herald of Gospel Liberty, July 28, 1927

EDITORIAL

Unquestionably the most hopeful sign on the religious horizon today is the clarifying emphasis upon the spiritual experience. For a half century or more religionists have gone far afield and have gathered many and varied interests into the wide compass of their quest. On the one hand there have been intellectual explorations in the name of religion into every branch and phase of learning; and on the other hand, religious interest has been diversified, and sometimes almost dissipated, in a thousand lines of social service endeavor applied to every type of human need. The one has led to a vast deal of intellectualism, both Fundamentalist and Modernist, without any spiritual experience; and the other has led to a vast amount of charitable enterprise and kindly feeling in which there has been no religious passion whatever. Both are good and serve a necessary purpose—both the high thinking and the service activities. But neither of them is necessarily religious, though done in the name of religion. Religion, if the word is not to lose its historic significance altogether, must stand for a spiritual experience—and the Christian religion, for a distinctive type of spiritual experience.

It comes as a happy omen indeed, then, that the primacy of this spiritual experience is being stressed as not before in recent years, if ever, in high and influential circles. On every hand as perhaps never before one hears the insistence that Christianity is "a way" of life, that it is a living vitality and reality; and that if you do not have this, it matters not what else you do have, you do not have the Christian religion. The more sober-minded and thoughtful of the Funda-

mentalists have come to see that one can have "faith" without having any real Christian life and that on the other hand many do have very real and very fervent Christian life without having closely defined articles of Christian faith at all. They perceive that the Christian religion is something very much other and very much deeper than what we have been accustomed to call "theological beliefs". Hence they are not fighting so lustily as once they did for creedal conformity. Something of the same kind of leaven is now working among the liberals in the Church also. Some of the best exponents of ultra-liberalism are awakening to the fact that intellectualism is not religion, no mattter wheher that intellectualism be heterodox or orthodox. "Out of the heart are the issues of life"—the life-control which decides how a man will use what he knows and what he believes. And it is this life-control that more and more is coming into prominence in religious thinking and religious investigation.

The result of this is bound to be far-reaching. We have already noted something of the effect that it is having on the Fundamentalists. They are going in the future to say less about heresy of opinion and more about heresy of life; and that heresy of life is going to include one's attitude and objectives in industry, in politics, in racial and international relations, as well as in the minor moralities. The day will come when the question of whether one is a partisan in politics or a believer in war will play a bigger part in the Church than whether one dances or plays cards. Christianity will be counted "The Way," and that way will be a highway through the vast and momentous affairs of human destiny and not simply some little footpath or byroad for pensive and self-satisfied individuals or social sets. This will mean an entire culling over and realignment of a good deal which has heretofore passed as the Christian religion. Especially will it mean a new definition of the "spiritual" and what is *spiritual*. Too often it has been the case that those who have had the most to say, and who still have the most to say, about spirituality are the ones who have the poorest brand of it—a brand that is quickly dissipated when they get away from the prayer meeting or "revival" or mourner's bench that was fulsome and noisy with this sort of "spiritual experience". Equally often have men thought themselves to be highly spiritual when they were damning the Modernists and the liberals and others who do not believe with them. Such ideas of spirituality will have to be rooted out of the Church. We have had many and various evidences—within the past year or two some of them quite outstanding—as to how spurious is any such concept of the spiritual life. The conservatives in the Church are past due for a thorough overhauling of their ideas and practices of spirituality and how it is produced and manifested.

But if this be true so no less are the liberals dated for the same thing—and largely because of the same basic reason. They have been clearer moments, they realize that religion is a *life;* but, like the Fundamentalist, they seek that life through intellectual beliefs—only an entirely different set of beliefs. But unlike the Fundamentalists,

they have had little to say about spirituality because they have experimented little in the spiritual—having been too busy in scientific and philosophical research. Hence where the Fundamentalist's fields have been cluttered up with a lot of trumpery and trash, those of the Modernists have too often been as cold and barren as a heap of glistening sand. They have not even had the name of being spiritual, much less the fact. And now come some of their own most clear-eyed prophets seeing the fact that there is no moving passion, no driving voltage, no suffering-vicariousness in a religion like that to make it a reliant and comforting factor for either an individual or human society in those experiences and crusades for righteousness in which man and men most need a gripping, holding God. Even among the Unitarians is growing a sense of lack of this thing which above everything else is crucial in every *religion*, and a sense also that that which they have heretofore offered has been a sort of elite and de luxe edition for the intellectuals and the well-to-do and comfortable and of little account to the great masses of mankind who now and ever will hunger only for a religion that has a dominant note of "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Unitarians of the human touch and the prophetic insight are today sensing the insufficiency for such as these of the religion which they have offered, and a humiliating sense of inadequacy for our own times is beginning to stir within the folds of that proud brotherhood. This is no day in which to take pride in one's aristocracy of opinion or in one's exclusiveness from the common crowd—and least of all in the realms of religion. In vain will Unitarians fly to humanism as a way of escape—for that philosophy, which strangely enough calls itself a religion, deserts God as well as the masses. And so either the Modernists will discover a more real religion and a truer spirituality than has characterized their movement in the past, or, like Fundamentalism, it too will pass out as not having had sufficient of the imperatively vital life-element that alone can make the Christian religion.

Watching the Churches in Council

Reprinted by permission of The Northwestern Christian Advocate, Chicago, July 28, 1927

Paul Hutchinson

The church bodies differ decidedly in composition. After one trip to all of them you would never mistake a Presbyterian General Assembly for a Disciples' Convention, even if you strayed in without knowing what it was you were to attend. The Presbyterians and the Episcopalians, for instance, rely wholly upon the wisdom of male delegates. Both have meetings of women's organizations held along with the meetings of the denominational governing body, and both transact their business surrounded by a cloud of women witnesses. But both still give heed to St. Paul to the extent of relegating women to the margin when it comes actually to legislate for their churches.

Differences in Spirit

The Episcopalians differ from all the others in that their General Convention is divided, like most secular legislatures, into two houses. In the upper chamber the bishops pursue their grave concerns; in the lower the deputies hold forth.

The annual meetings of the Baptists and Disciples, although called conventions, are really not conventions at all. They are mass meetings. Delegates to the Baptist Convention do, it is true, represent local Baptist congregations. With the Disciples any member of the denomination who can get to the Convention and pay the nominal enrollment fee becomes a voting delegate. The question as to whether the church is to be liberal or conservative during any given twelve months, therefore, hinges largely on the decision as to the city in which the International Convention is to be held.

The Methodists present the most cosmopolitan appearance, for their organization into Annual Conferences on mission fields brings delegates from every continent save Australia. The Episcopalians are the most prosperous. Congregationalists and Presbyterians, however, have an equal air of commercial pretentiousness. Baptists and Disciples are too miscellaneous a collection to give any clear composite social portrait.

These church gatherings differ in spirit as well as in composition. The Methodist General Conference is distinctly a legislative body. It resembles a State legislature more than any other church council, but it is much more efficient in its procedure than most legislatures. Next to the Methodists, the Episcopalians are most concerned with denominational legislation. In recent years, however, this legislative preoccupation in the Episcopal body has confined itself largely to changes in the prayer book.

The Passing of Theological Fights

Sessions of the bodies that meet annually have, since I have been attending them, been passing through a cycle of fundamentalist difficulty. In all three bodies there were years when it seemed as though the ministers and congregations who would not give explicit consent to a rigid and ultra-conservative creed might be forced out. In each case, however, the denomination as a whole, although conservative in its thinking, has become wearied of the bitter recriminations. Among the Baptists and Disciples the fundamentalists who insist on continuing the fight are being rapidly forced out into little marginal groups of their own. Significantly enough, in both these communions the recent fighting, when it came to a focus, centered on what was being taught and done on mission fields.

Where the Chief Interest Lies in the Different Gatherings

Of them all, I would say that the Congregationalists are the least absorbed in denominational affairs and the most concerned in what might be called public questions. This was particularly evident at their Springfield session in 1923 and at Washington in 1925. At Omaha this year, while there was still plenty of interest left for ques-

tions such as prohibition, compulsory military drill in colleges, economic imperialism, and the like, the drift toward a tightening up of the denominational machinery was also evident. There is also a tendency to do most of the real deciding of important matters in a small, semi-permanent executive committee. I should say that while the Methodists, who are generally considered the most machine-bound of all Protestant bodies, are growing increasingly restive; the Congregationalists, who have been thought the freest, are drifting most rapidly toward a national inclusive denominational machine. Many Congregationalists see this, and fear it. But they do not see how to escape it.

In recent years all these bodies have given considerable time to the rearrangement of their boards. The tendency is toward amalgamation. The Congregationalists have almost reached the "one big board" state. In every communion these changes are supported in the interest of economy. But I notice that, after the boards have been telescoped, most of the old office holders are still considered a necessity.

There have been times during the last four years when I have found myself wondering whether these general church gatherings helped or hindered the cause of religion. I will not soon forget the remark of one newspaper reporter who had been attending several of them. After a long period of silence he suddenly asked, "Will you tell me what these church conventions have to do with religion?" He clearly believed the answer must be, "Nothing."

Increasing Interest in Religious Questions

I will admit that there has been times when I have felt almost ready to agree. Just at present, however, I am not so sure. A curious thing has happened in at least two of the general church conventions this year. There has been evident a genuine and powerful spiritual hunger. The Baptists, after five or six tormenting years, almost turned their convention of 1927 into a prayer meeting. Even more significant, however, was the way in which the calm, poised, undemonstrative Congregationalists were shaken by an address by a professor of theology from Union Theological Seminary on changing conceptions of God! It was a hopeful sign that such an address was included in their national council program in the first place. But it was an astonishment to see the way in which, having had one taste of that sort of thing, the delegates tore the rest of the program up and forced a second, and then a third, session devoted to this topic!

I move around a good deal among the colleges, as well as among the denominational gatherings. Four, three, two years ago, if you went into a meeting of college students the topics for which consideration was demanded were, almost always, war, race, industrial relations, social readjustments; and those were also the topics that struck fire in the church gatherings. This year if you go to the colleges the first question is, almost always, "Can we believe in God?" And now the Baptists—under the leadership of a Texas preacher—and the Congregationalists—under the leadership of a theological professor—have struck the same note. I wonder what will interest the Methodists at Kansas City next year?

Inaugural Address

Reprinted by permission of The Lutheran Church Review, Philadelphia, July, 1927

Charles M. Jacobs

Delivered upon the occasion of his inauguration to the Presidency of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, April 22, 1927, by Dr. C. M. Jacobs.

The theological seminary is a school in which a living faith is seeking, and by God's grace finding, ever new means of expression in forms of knowledge. But all of its teachings draws to a focus upon a single purpose—which is the purpose of the Church and the purpose of the preacher—to bring men to the experience of the unsearchable riches of the grace of God in Jesus Christ our Lord.

In the accomplishment of that purpose, our Church recognizes only one efficient instrument. It has been given to men to be used by them, but in origin and nature and power it is divine. We call it the Word of God. So vital and essential is this Word, so utterly is the life of the Church bound up with it, that it becomes to us the mark of the Church, the sign by which we know that the Church is present.

The Word of God, then, is the center of the Church. It is the Church's dearest possession. When it is lost, the Church's life is gone. At the heart of historic Lutheranism are two convictions that are fundamental to it. They are—first, To be a Christian means to have that faith which is an active, living trust in God, through Jesus Christ, His Son; and second, This faith, which makes men Christians, is produced by God Himself, Who comes to heart and conscience through His Word. It is but the corollary of these statements when we declare that the supreme purpose for which the Church exists is to bring this Word to men.

We believe that our continued existence as a church, separate and distinct from others, is fully justified; it is because we have this very definite belief about the nature and the purpose of the Church. Therefore we believe that the only sound approach toward a union of the churches must be through the question, What is the Word of God?

But with all the emphasis which we lay upon the Scriptures, we do not identify them with the Word of God. We confess that the Word of God is a means of grace; none of us will say that the Bible is a means of grace, save as it preserves in human languages and passes down from generation to generation the record of God's Word. God's revelation recorded in the Scriptures, His Word about Himself and ourselves that is written there, came "in divers parts and divers manners unto the fathers," before it came at last in His own Son, "the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of His person."

That which we seek in Holy Scripture is this revelation, this God-given insight into the nature of God and man, this Word of God that enters the depths of our hearts, convicting of sin and righteousness and judgment, and calling us to seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God.

These convictions lay upon us a responsibility which we have no wish to evade. They compel us to a scientific study of the Scriptures. There are some pious minds in which that phrase arouses instant prejudice. In actual fact the term means nothing else than the orderly use of all available knowledge in the effort to understand and interpret whatever truth we are studying.

An institution that it to train men to be preachers of the Gospel cannot be merely or chiefly a school of theories, even of theories about religion and about the Bible. It has a truth to impart that is larger than our theories about it—the truth of sin and salvation; of the Cross and the Empty Tomb; of Christ, the Revealer and Teacher and Redeemer; the truth of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Eighteen centuries of Christian history lie between us and the writing of the Scriptures. We are the heirs of all those centuries. They have contained four great epochs; we may be living in the fifth. Each of those epochs has produced some characteristic interpretation of the Gospel; the Reformation produced more than one.

To one of these interpretations of the Gospel the Lutheran Church is a witness. Her Confessions themselves were not framed by men who sat down together to prepare new creeds and therefore tried to state all of their convictions in logical form and order. On the contrary, they were very literally extorted from their authors by circumstances which these authors could in no respect control. The single exception is Luther's Catechism, which might have been written at any time after 1520. With this exception, all the Lutheran Confessions —from the Augsburg Confession, with which the series starts, to the Formula of Concord, with which it ends—are products of definite historical situations. It is only in view of these situations that they can be correctly understood. They are not systems of theology. In the language of the Formula of Concord, they are "a witness and declaration of the faith, as to how at any time the Holy Scriptures have been understood in the articles in controversy in the Church of God by those who then lived, and how the opposite dogma was condemned" (Form. Conc., ed. Jacobs, I. Intro., 8, p. 492).

We accept them when we are convinced that, faced with the questions which the writers of the Confessions had to meet, we would have answered them as they did. In this view of the Confessions we have that wise balance between authority and liberty, which makes it possible to conserve the values which the past has bequeathed to us, and at the same time to meet, not with old formulas, but with living convictions, the questions which new times are always bringing.

On the other hand, we recognize that in the answers which the Confessions give to the questions that the sixteenth century discussed we have a definite and positive doctrine. We have, in other words, an interpretation of the Gospel of Christ. It is not narrow, but has that breadth which belongs to simple and essential things. On its possession our Church bases its right to existence. But this very fact obligates us the more sacredly to an ever renewed study of the Gospel, nay more, it obliges us always to consider the possibility that the day

may come when new problems for the Church, new types of unbelief, new forms of false doctrines, new religious crises, shall lay on us the duty to do what the confessors did, and leave to the generations that shall follow us similar monuments to our faith.

This view of the Confessions has long been held and taught among us. In it we are agreed. By the Confessions of the Church, interpreted in this historic sense, we are content to have our teaching judged.

In all of this we are true to the spirit of our Church. But while it seeks to hold the values that have been passed down from generation to generation, the Lutheran Church seeks also to add to them those other values which experience is daily creating. We dare not sacrifice established values for untried theories; we shall not rewrite or discard the Scriptures or the Confessions of the Church; but we shall go forward, with God's help. The places where this progress will be made, where these new appreciations and understandings and convictions will ultimately find expression, are our theological seminaries.

Views on Christian Unity

Reprinted by permission of The Christian Union Quarterly, Baltimore.

July, 1927

How the Laymen See It

The Christian Union Quarterly asked a number of American laymen their opinion as to the barriers in the way of a united Christendom and the methods of removal. Two-thirds to whom inquiries were sent courteously declined to answer, some being too busy and others giving as the reason that such questions did not belong to the laymen, who must look to their spiritual teachers for guidance in such matters. This raises the interesting query as to the degree of the layman's interest in Christian unity and also to what degree he follows his spiritual teachers.

Of the twelve answers half are from Episcopalians, although about the same number were written to in other communions, from which it might be concluded that Episcopal laymen are more interested in Christian unity than the laymen of other communions. The World Conference on Faith and Order, which had its origin in the Episcopal Church, is to meet next month in Lausanne. This may contribute something to Episcopal interest, but not to such an extent as to bring from them nearly half of the responses. Besides it is no longer an Episcopal organization. It is an organization that belongs to the whole Church. These replies, however, raise the question as to whether the Episcopal layman is more closely identified with the work of his communion than the laymen of other communions and, therefore, is more interested in all questions that pertain to the Church.

These laymen see barriers to unity in office holders, the sacraments, the doctrine of the immaculate conception, apostolic succession, the priesthood, the historic episcopate, forms of baptism, forms of worship, forms of church government, papal supremacy and infallibility, the Roman Catholic Church, uniformity, denominational property holdings, transubstantiation, unwillingness or inability to follow Jesus as

the true, complete, and perfect revelation of God, not in differences but in prejudice that still insists that each little group of believers be held together under a separate name and be branded by a common motto that differentiates their peculiar and relatively unimportant differences from other bodies of Christians.

They see the removal of these barriers in the recognition of all forms of ordination, of all forms of baptism, of sincerity of Roman Catholics in their belief that the pope is the vice-gerent of God, the practice of a broader appreciation of love, tolerance, clarifying the whole problem, deepening of mutual respect, removal of creeds, dogmatism, and theological doctrines, cooperation in foreign missionary activities, educational processes to free this creed-minded generation, differing groups meeting around the council table, that rational conclusions never agree except in pure logic and mathematics, hence the mystical character of Christianity is the only basis of agreement, that the Church needs a new emphasis on God, prayer, love, service, spiritual power, and eternal life in a rational and simple way for the millions who are groping for a scientific faith with spiritual power, and the order of growth toward unity is co-operation, federation, and then unity.

As the Roman Catholic Sees It

By Rev. J. Arthur M. Richey

Managing Editor of *The Antidote, Garrison, N. Y.*

In his prayer for unity our Blessed Lord prayed: "As Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." This prayer, which set an example for his followers, declares his Divinity and reveals the motive for Christian union.

We must first of all unite on Christ as God Incarnate. That we have not done so, and are not thus far doing so, there is some indication of evidence. For example, in the last issue of *The Quarterly* (April 1927), appears an article, "Christian Unity—The Ideal of Youth for the Church," by Rev. Walter W. Van Kirk, being, as a foot-note tells us, the opening chapter of a book on *Youth and Christian Unity.*

This article is of more than casual importance because it is written by one who is the "Secretary of the Federal Council of Church of Christ in America" and who, in more than a remote sense, is their spokesman. Here is a portion of the second paragraph which, doubtless, sounds the key-note of the volume; in any case it cannot be ignored:

"When the question is raised as to why youth should be particularly interested in this problem of Christian unity the answer is immediately forthcoming that the man who on the way to the Garden of Gethsemane first prayed for the unity of the Church was a young man. That must never be forgotten. Jesus was not old enough to be practical. He was quite too young to be familiar with the things that couldn't be done. It was in the audacious faith of his early thirties that Jesus prayed for the religious unity of his followers. Other young men are now following in the footsteps of their youthful Master. They, too, are praying for the Oneness of the Church of God."

Where did Dr. Van Kirk get the idea that Jesus Christ ever exercised an "audacious faith" or any other kind of faith? Faith is the absence of knowledge, the substance of hope without sensible evidence. As God, Jesus could not have or exercise faith, and there is not a line in the New Testament anywhere which attributes such faith to Him. He could deliver the Faith to his Church for its credence and guardianship, but He Himself could not exercise faith where He possessed complete knowledge. "* * * He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." This is not faith. It is part of the omniscience of Divine Being having "all power in Heaven and on earth." Then, how can it be said that "Jesus was not old enough to be practical"? or that "He was quite too young to be familiar with the things that couldn't be done"?

Here is the very foundation of Christian union compromised by a palpable denial of the Divinity of Christ through an official spokesman of the Federal Council of Churches.

Often, with blindness in part, if with good intentions, in mattters of religion, as well as of science and philosophy, our age remains superficial. The letter killeth the truth because words have lost their meaning and breed confusion of thought. But there must be no confusion of thought as to the Divinity of Christ among those who seek Christian union. It would be very much more honest, and very much more in the interest of true Christian unity, if those who do not sincerely believe in the true Divinity of Christ, would say so and unite with the Unitarians. As it is, they are not entering the Kingdom of Christ themselves, and those who would enter they are hindering.

The first requisite to union—as paradoxical as it may sound—is division. The Lausanne Conference may say that we have had too much of that already, but if they are not merely to play with the truth they must say, without equivocation, whether Christ is truly God or not, and those who cannot acknowledge this truth should not embarrass, by their unbelief, those who believe.

Let the denominations get back to Christ, and then it will be time to consider his Church.

"America Comes of Age"

Reprinted by permission of The Catholic World, New York, July, 1927

EDITORIAL

A most provocative book is Andre Siegfried's *America Comes of Age*. It provokes hearty assent and equally hearty dissent. It is good and bad, right and wrong, true and false, as any foreigner's judgment of our complex American civilization, ethnic, political, and economic, might well be.

It is a very carefully reasoned document. The author is no mere dogmatist. There is continuity and consistency in his thought. He does not directly argue, but his paragraphs and his chapters are arguments, none the less. Perhaps the chief argument of the book is one against the excessive "Americanization" of America. Professor Siegfried does indeed assume—or rather he *insists*, again and again, that

American civilization is essentially "Anglo-Saxon" and Protestant. But M. Siegfried makes clear the fact that to keep America Anglo-Saxon and Protestant, would be to deprive America of its chance for true development. "The Americans," he says, "have a vague fear of being overwhelmed from within, and of suddenly finding one day that they are no longer themselves." But nowhere does he agree that it would be well for America to remain Anglo-Saxon-Protestant.

There are many elements which the incoming aliens can contribute to the American character, with great advantage to America. For example, the Latins have a passion (at least so M. Siegfried says) for the independence of the individual. We used to think that a stalwart independence was characteristic of the Puritan American. "The idea that his personality is being constantly suppressed is almost painful to a Latin," says Siegfried. And, "on the other hand, in America, those who follow lone trails are heartily disliked." M. Siegfried doubtless refers to a lone train of *thought*, not of adventure—he means that in America independent *thinking* is penalized, whereas in France, and elsewhere in Europe, it is admired and rewarded.

So, paradoxically, it may be that the Anglo-Saxons will have to learn liberty from the Latins. To me, at least, this is a new idea. I imagine it will be new to most of the readers of *America Comes of Age*. But we dare not reject a new idea simply because it is new. Such intellectual inhospitality would be only one more evidence of our lack of liberty. The question of the relative personal liberty of Latins and Americans is a nice one.

Our critic from overseas points out another anomaly in the American character. The American is "modern" but "anti-modernistic." He prates of his fondness for being "up to date." He considers himself progressive. But he is progressive only in so far as progress concerns machinery, and the materialistic betterment of life. He is a great adventurer on sea and on land, but no adventurer at all in the realm of the mind; and it is for this reason that he is intolerant in religion. "The Fundamentalists," says M. Siegfried (and of course your hundred per center is a fundamentalist), "are the spiritual descendants of Cromwell, and they have remained faithful to his inflexible religious bigotry . . . The Ku Klux Klan expresses both their prejudices and their fears. They are instinctively hostile to the broader conceptions of social welfare, for they are hypnotized by the defense of old-fashioned customs against those of today."

M. Siegfried indicates that these "Anglo-Saxons" might learn tolerance, as well as liberty, from the Latins . There is sweet irony here—that those who complain of the Spanish Inquisition, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, the cruelties of the Duke of Alva—all Latin crimes—should be the only ones in the modern world to keep alive an intolerance that the Latins have long since abandoned!

M. Siegfried does not draw the conclusion, in so many words, but he indicates a hundred times over that if the hundred per cent Americans could succeed in thoroughly "Americanizing" the Latins, the Celts, the Slavs, and all the other non-Anglo-Saxon elements, they

would destroy the very character for which America is, or was, famous —originality, initiative, enterprise (particularly intellectual enterprise), dash and daring, to say nothing of liberty and of tolerance. Here then is another of the paradoxes that the Frenchmen throws in our faces—Americanization would ruin America.

Fortunately Americanization does not thoroughly "Americanize." The racial traits fortunately are never obliterated. What a calamity it would be for America if she were the inheritor of only one type of civilization, and that one the least desirable. Siegfried seems, for a moment, to fear that this calamity has arrived, for he says, "The immigrants and their sons have lost the rich heritage of magnificent civilization, and the amputation has been clean and merciless."

But on the same page, he speaks of "three successive stages of the racial crisis." "First, when the immigrants. . . change the old American atmosphere, until the early inhabitant feels he is literally turned out of his house. Secondly, when the foreigner is absorbed superficially, but retains at heart his own moral and political ideas. Finally when the foreigner insists that he is absolutely American, although he is not willing to give up his religion, or intellectual or artistic traditions.

Here is, perhaps, the biggest thought in the book. America will be greater than the "Americans" dream, it will also be different. Whether or not it is still (as M. Siegfried thinks) Anglo-Saxon, Protestant and Puritan, it cannot continue to be so. It is well that it should not continue to be so. Siegfried recalls the prophetic words of Israel Zangwill, "America is God's crucible, the great melting pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming . . . The real American has not yet arrived. He is only in the crucible. I tell you—he will be the fusion of all races, perhaps the coming superman." If Zangwill, as is probable, has the Jews particularly in mind, Siegfried (not a Catholic) has a word to say for Catholics: "The Catholics cherish this idea when they maintain in all sincerity that there is no need for them to sacrifice their religion in order to become Americans."

Of the two concepts, America as a mere development or expansion of the Anglo-Saxon civilization, and America as a fusion of all the civilizations of the world, there can be no question as to which is the grander. Hence it may be that the despised foreigners have a nobler vision of the America of the future—the Ultimate America—than the native American.

Of course there are no "pure" races. A "pure" race probably could not continue to exist. It would kill itself off with inbreeding. Every vigorous race is a multiple hybrid. Perhaps the American race will be a combination of all the races that ever have existed. They are all here, now, and they are all commingling. Any race that desires to be largely represented in the composite American of the future will do well to observe the Scriptural command, "Increase and multiply." No one race will dominate our future. Least of all will any race be dominant if its representatives in the present are bent upon self-destruction, while they bitterly criticize the fertility of rival races.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

What to Preach, by *Henry Sloane Coffin*, Brown Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, and President of the Faculty, in Union Theological Seminary. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York, 1926. 189 pages.

In these lectures, first held before Scotch audiences in Edinburg and Glasgow, the author, formerly for 21 years pastor of the Madison Ave. Presbyterian Church, New York City, now president of Union Seminary, suggests courses of subjects for preaching. The question, what shall I preach on? is for the minister a puzzling problem at least 52 times a year. It stands to reason that the answer can not be left to chance or to the mood of the moment. The preacher ought to have a plan, and in laying it out he ought to provide for a well balanced treatment of the whole range of the Christian faith and life. His text book is the bible, and his message covers the beliefs, the principles and trials of the Christian. Therefore the author discusses his subject under the heads of expository, doctrinal, ethical and pastoral preaching, concluding with a fifth chapter on evangelistic preaching. Mr. Coffin thinks that the emphasis laid 10-15 years ago on *prophetic* preaching as being a chief characteristic of the modern preacher, was overdone. The prophet spoke to the nation; the preacher, to his parish. The prophet had a very special call in a sense not applicable to the ordinary preacher. The latter is, more correctly, a teacher of religion, of "the life with God."

In the bible we have the standard expression of this life, and if we are to lead our people into it we will year after year explore with them the contents of the Scripture. Hence the minister will be first and foremost an expository preacher. Only so can he be sure to be in line with the historic spiritual past which he is seeking to continue in his hearers; and only so can he give his own limited experience some of the variety and fulness of the Scriptures. The writer suggests quite a number of courses which the preacher might follow in this field. He may preach on the main contents of the principal books of the bible; or on the questions asked by Jesus; or questions asked of Jesus; or, again, on questions asked concerning Jesus; or on Paul's circle of friends, etc.

We doubt very much whether we could follow out these suggestions in our own congregations. To preach on whole books Sunday after Sunday, would soon empty out our churches; or preaching, again and again, on questions by, of, or concerning Jesus, would probably have the same effect. It is our way to preach on longer texts than is cus-

tomary in other churches, and to bring into their treatment more of *text exposition.* If we stick to that and do not yield too much to the prevailing fondness for very brief text verses, or even clauses we shall be wise. Some time ago we heard a sermon by a prominent Presbyterian on "If risen" (Col. 3, 1). We considered it in poor taste and faulty in judgment. He had to bring in the context, later, anyway, so why not read the whole verse or passage in the first place?

Mr. Coffin is a Modernist, but not, on that account, opposed to doctrinal preaching. On the contrary, he believes firmly in it. If so many say, give us practical sermons, he declares that the right kind of doctrinal sermons is also the most practical. It sets forth what God is and does and so opens the door into ample life with Him.

So often people demand *inspirational* sermons; still many of these have a maximum of heat and a mimimum of light. Good is the advice of Lyman Beecher to his son: "Have one sermon a week that will tax your intellect and the intellect of your hearers."

The doctrines must be couched in modern terms. The views in which bible saints saw and embodied their religious experience are not ours. Preaching for instance on the ascension of Christ we will not share the crude notions of the disciples of an actual levitation of Christ's body up into the air, but see in it only the fact of his enthronement. "We carry over from the first century the abiding conviction of the Lordship of Jesus."

Yes, we say, but how were the disciples made aware of that if there was no actual ascension? If there was only a spiritual fact in their consciousness, how did they come to tell us of an outward miracle?

In discussing the miraculous it is Coffin's way to spiritualize it, that is, to evolve the religious teaching out of it, and leave the recorded facts themselves unexplained, if necessary. It will often be impossible for us to say what happened. We believe in a God who "does wondrous things, so that we cannot confine him within man's discoveries of his usual ways."

This explanation of the miraculous in the New Testament seems to us very unsatisfactory. We are told there that Christ healed the sick, raised the dead, fed the hungry; that he rose from the dead and went to heaven. Now, according to Coffin, we are to admit that all these things are there but we don't know what actually happened; we are to be satisfied to know that God is all-sufficient for our present necessities. But if he didn't do the things the New Testament said he did, how could he have shown that he was sufficient for the necessities of his contempories? And if the plain narratives of his works there are not to be believed, how can we believe he will be able to do the much greater works he promises to do: give rest to all heavy laden ones; be the light of the world; that all the dead will hear his voice and come forth; and that all the kingdom of this world shall be his?

However, we may disagree with the author on the miraculous, but we freely admit that he never dodges a subject because it is difficult or because it is controversial. He proposes courses on the bible, the

trinity, on Jesus Christ, God, man, sin, salvation, and above all, on the cross. He is very skillful in formulating his subjects so that they are an adequate expression of the text. This is especially striking in the chapter on *ethical* preaching.

He rightly says that it is not enough to make all our preaching culminate in the demand that the hearer accept Christ. It must be shown what the ethical content of such a step is. Lay out a plan on the Christian's duties, or Wisdom's Ways (book of Proverbs) in friendship, conversation, hospitality, business dealings, work, self-control, and so on. Or on the fruits of the spirit; the beatitudes; love; or on the Christian management of life (dealing with the body, feelings; tastes; time; money; disappointments.) Or, a Christian's use of his possessions; faith and fatigue; faith and nervousness. No one to-day will neglect the social gospel. The danger is almost that he forgot the culture of individual reconstruction, or, at least, the contemplative side of it.

In the chapter on *pastoral* teaching he deals with the afflictions and special experiences of the Christian; with the church, of which he has a very high appreciation (the supreme factor for social cohesion); the support of the church; Missions; Church Union; Modernism (he pleads for reasonable freedom within his own communion, so that the pulpits may "not be closed to God-owned preachers of the gospel." (Fosdick?)

He concludes with *evangelistic* preaching, which aims at immediate decision. He recommends texts of a "wooing" nature; plenty of illustration; an arresting style; ardent oratory; the kindling action of the Holy Spirit.

Even a casual reader of the book would be struck with the amazing richness of the writer's homiletical suggestions. He draws from an inexhaustible font of pulpit experience. He finds texts for almost any conceivable subject, or else the text yields him a subject of the most surprising appropriateness. He opens the eyes of the reader to the boundless wealth of scripture material; or if he is at a loss for preaching courses, here is a veritable cornucopia of them.

If the preacher's mind is at all jaded let him turn to a chapter of this book.

The Philosophy of Personalism. A Study in the Metaphysics of Religion by *Albert C. Knudson*, Dr. of theology, Dean of Boston University School of Theology. The Abington Press, 1927. 438 pages, $3.50.

To give an exposition of Personalism in general and the position of its chief American representative, Borden P. Bowne, late professor of philosophy of Boston University, in particular, is the purpose of this book. The influence of Bowne on theological students in the Methodist church was great, but his philosophical system has not received the recognition which in the opinion of this author, it deserves. Our age does not look with favor on meta-physical questions. It is either frankly materialistic or contents itself with showing up the

pragmatic usefulness of religious attitudes: it avails itself of the consequences and fruits of certain beliefs while avoiding to investigate whether they are based in ultimate reality. The centuries have produced so many unsatisfactory or even contradictory attempts to reach ultimates that to many it seems idle to continue the Sisyphus task.

Nevertheless the search for an explanation of the world of reality seems structural to the human mind. The interest in the questions about the first cause, the nature of the human soul and the world, will not down. Material tasks or material sciences may for a time shut us up to the world of phenomena; in the long run the metaphysical will again demand consideration.

Under these circumstances a philosophical system as recent as Bowne's ought to be accorded a ready hearing. We can at least be sure that he is in close touch with the facts and demands of the hour. He is not himself the father of the system. He is rather the pupil of the German philosopher, Lotze, but Lotze's system has found in him its fullest elaboration. To the Christian mind Personalism commends itself by the importance placed on personality and by its advocacy of theism. The idea of personality is naturally fundamental to the system of Personalism. The reality of the soul or self or "I" is the cardinal presupposition of personalism. The union of soul and body in personality is the place, and the only place, where the dualism of thought and things, of mind and matter, which runs through all reality, seems transcended. Therefore personality is the key to the problem of reality, it is, in the last analysis, the solution of the great world riddle.

In its theory of knowledge Personalism follows Kant. Kant has shown that our knowledge of the outside world is not immediate, is not like a picture photographed on the mind by the material objects, but rather the product of man's reason working with and arranging the sense experiences. Only by applying its mental categories can the human mind build up an orderly conception of the impressions given by sensation. Kant held that what we perceive relates only to phenomena; that the thing in itself is not known by us; that we cannot state anything about it. The author here disagrees with Kant. If we could get hold only of phenomena and not of the thing itself, then there would be no causal ground of the phenomena, they would be the appearance of nothing. Personalism, he says here, believes in the separate existence of thought and things, it is dualistic in its epistomology.

On the nature of the soul Personalism shows a wide difference of opinions. The writer's own is as follows: The soul is not a substance, not even an immaterial substance, in the old sense of the word; that is, not a passive thing, an inert core of being, a substratum, that does nothing but exist. It is an agent, an agent that has no existence apart from its activities. Its very being consists in its activities.

Here we are apt to record disagreement. The author says, "Men are prone to detach the agent from its activity, thus virtually falling back into the old idea of a soul-substance." Yes, they do indeed de-

tach the agent thus, but if that is a mistake the author is himself guilty, for he says (on p. 385): "To deny the self and assert the reality of its activities is absurd. Without an agent there can be no activities."

God, in Personalism, is metaphysically absolute. He is the one independent causal ground of the world: in biblical terms, the creator. This material world, however, is phenomenal through and through. There are no hidden entities lying back of the physical atoms. (No, but are the physical atoms real or only phenomenal? In its epistomology Personalism was dualistic, how can it be monistic in its metaphysics? Rev.)

In chapter IV the author deals with Personalism (and philosophy in general) and its relation to religious belief. Can philosophy be a support to faith? The medieval world thought it could; to-day, after Kant, we have largely given up this hope. Still, he says, while philosophical arguments, for instance those for the existence of a divine being, never offer a conclusive proof, they, nevertheless, can show the reasonableness of such faith and, therefore, have apologetic value.

In ch. V, "Militant Personalism," Materialism, Natural Realism, Absolute Idealism, Empiricism, Pragmatism are discussed and rejected.

The author, in conclusion, thinks he has shown that Personalism is no mere novelty or philosophical sport, that it represents one of the oldest and broadest currents in the history of human thought; that it stands organically and structurally related to the spiritual philosophy of all the ages; that it is the ripe fruit of more than two millenniums of intellectual toil, the apex of a pyramid whose base was laid by Plato and Aristotle.

The book shows a most remarkable grasp on the philosophical thought of the time. When we had read Prof. Knudson's books on Prophetic Teaching and so forth, we thought the Old Testament was his specialty. But after reading his "Religious Tendencies" and especially, after the perusal of the present volume, we get a wonderfully enlarged idea of the range of his information. Any one who feels that he ought to bring his philosophy up to date—and there ought to be many—will do well to get this book and study the system of the American who handled the question of ultimate reality better than the Neo-Hegelians on the one side, or the Pragmatists on the other.

The Evolution of Charles Darwin, by *Geo. A. Dorsey*, Ph.D. Doubleday, Page and Co., New York, 1927. 300 pages.

This is a popular life of the great naturalist, the protagonist of the theory of evolution. The book while going little into the details of the great theory which made Darwin famous, gives a most interesting story of his development.

His father was a successful physician, who acquired great wealth, which not only enabled him to give his son a good education but also, later, to leave him enough to give his life entirely to the pursuit of science.

Charles Darwin, born 1809, early showed a passion for collecting minerals, beetles, etc. But it was only after he had first spent several years as a medical and three years more as a divinity student, that he decided to follow the career of a naturalist. It was his 5-year voyage on the Beagle that opened his eyes to the task that nature had designed him for. Like A. von Humboldt before him (the "greatest scientific traveler that ever lived," according to Darwin himself) he drank in deep the beauties of the tropic zone. At the same time he studied carefully the plants and animals of the parts he visited, together with their geological formation.

In 1838 he had come to believe in evolution but he waited 20 years before he published it to the world. The belief that species was a creation by divine fiat had been held as long as man had accepted the Mosaic tradition. It had also become a part of the Christian faith, was an important point in the doctrine of original sin and in that of redemption by Christ, the "second Adam." To disturb, much more to demolish that belief would be a revolutionary undertaking, which would set the world and the church against him. No wonder that he wanted to be more sure himself before he was ready to take the steer by the horns. By a strange coincidence his friend Wallace had come upon the evolutionary theory in the same year, independently of Darwin.

In 1858 the "Origin of Species by Natural Selection" was published. The storm it aroused was even worse than he expected. But while the world laughed at it and the church thundered its anathema upon him, his friends, Lyell, the geologist, Asa Gray of Harvard, Huxley and Wallace stood by him.

The book before us gives only the barest outline of the theory of evolution, namely: that species is not immutable; that it is played upon by environment; that the great increase of individuals of a species is faced by a scarcity of the means of subsistence. In the struggle for existence those survive that are fittest, i. e. those which can adapt themselves best to a changing environment. This adaptation produces slight variations in the individual's structure, which are handed down to the offspring. In long periods of time and by a very slow process of adaption, a new species will finally arrive. Darwin calls the method by which this is accomplished "natural selection." This sounds as though nature was a personal agent. To avoid this misunderstanding he later accepted Spencer's "survival of the fittest" for it.

The arduous labors that Darwin pursued in collecting his materials; in reading all that pertained to it; his patience and accuracy of observation; his persistent, never flagging reflection on the problem in hand: these are all the more wonderful when one considers that for 40 years he hardly ever had the health of an ordinary man. Nervous indigestion accompanied with dizziness, stomach trouble, insomnia were his daily bread. Without the tender care of his wife he could never have done half his work.

The intense application with which he carried on his epoch-making researches, robbed him finally of all capacity for the enjoyment of the higher aesthetic tastes. His religious life also died of atrophy. God, providence, soul, immortality were to him things about which we don't know anything; speculations about it are idle. He had studied the gospel carefully, he said, and had come to the conclusion that there was no revelation in it. "Unbelief," he said, "crept over me slowly but it at last grew to be complete. It caused me, however, no distress because it was so gradual."

His character was noble, free from all mean traits, his disposition sweet, and his mind cheerful. On March 19, 1882, he died, 73 years old. He was buried in Westminister Abbey.

The book is interesting in giving us a life like picture of Darwin the man, the character, the father, the friend, the observer, the writer. It is written with the enthusiasm of an ardent disciple. He says Darwin lived a "Chrislike life," meaning he showed the Christian virtues in operation. Still Christ himself says, "this is life eternal that they know thee, the true God. . ." Darwin did not know God. He considered such knowledge idle speculations. His science was his religion. He explored nature, with nature's God he had no fellowship.

Reviewer cannot dogmatize on the validity of Darwin's theory. He is, however, convinced that the origin of life itself, the origin of consciousness; of the moral and religious sense and the personality of Jesus cannot be explained by the theory of evolution; that they are not mere products of forces resident in nature.

The Confessions of a Reformer, by *Frederick C. Howe.* New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925. 352 pages.

For a long time we have not read a book that interested us as has this one. This is due in part to the fact that on its pages we have striking delineations of public characters connected with Cleveland, such as Mark Hanna, Tom Johnson, Newton Baker, Herrick, and others; and in part to the intimate insight the writer gives us into his own development, thereby bearing out the title of he book ("Confessions").

In many respects the writer's story is a history of disillusionment. He had preconceived ideas about his own class, about public life, the state, the constitution which all in time underwent serious modification. He was born and brought up at Meadville, Pa., where the Methodists have a college and where their influence predominates. To his mind the "good people" were the ones who went to church, had had evangelical (revival) experiences, who lived a moral life and were conscientious about their duties and Republicans in politics.

On the other side were the Democrats, many of them foreigners, people who frequented the saloon, swore and seemed to lead a looser life. But as he entered into politics he came to see that those good people were not so good after all; that however good they might be

in their private lives, they used the community and the state for their personal enrichment, they bribed officers, councilmen and members of legislature. These things might be bad, they admitted, but they had to be done because otherwise one could not do business in this imperfect world. Going to Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, then one of the most liberal and progressive universities of the country, he gives an interesting pen portrait of Mr. Wilson, who was at that time their chief lecturer. "Woodrow Wilson loved England as the mother of civil liberty and of parliamentary government. . . In his mind England was the literal mother of America. His chief criticism of the American Constitution related to those features which failed to follow the British parliamentary model. Wilson prized the blood of his forebears, which flowed back in its purity to old England. When during the Peace Conference he came to Buckingham Palace, he was proud of the service which he had been able to render to the mother country." As one reads such words one understands why Wilson did not "keep us out of the war" very long.

Howe's early ambition was to be a journalist. However, not finding an early opening there, he studied law at New York City and was later taken into the law firm of the Garfields (president Garfield's sons), at Cleveland. He hated the law and did not come to love it more by his connection with it. "The law glories in the past, in the opinions of Coke, Littleton, and Marshall. It is almost the only body of human thought that is guided by the opinions and ideas of the past. It is for this reason, among others, that lawyers are peculiarly unfitted for public office. They resist change. They are instinctively hostile to anything new. They are inexperienced in constructive things. Their professional life and training is associated with the past. They want the past preserved."

The most interesting part of the book begins when Howe comes under the influence of Tom Johnson, for 10 years mayor of Cleveland, waging war on monopoly. His great antagonist was Mark Hanna. The pictures of the two men he draws are revealing and of compelling interest. The immediate struggle revolved about two main issues: the public ownership of public utilities, especially the street railways, and the reduction of carfares to three cents. Tom Johnson, formerly a monopolist himself, had been "converted" by Henry George, the single tax apostle, and with the same ardor with which he had once pursued monopolistic wealth, he now bent himself to the task of freeing the city from monopoly. "Mark Hanna and Tom Johnson were strangely alike. They were alike in their titanic mould. They had courage, directness, and power to command. . . . Both men were lawless. They respected neither the laws nor the courts. They knew how laws were made. They had used political power in the city council and in the State legislatures to tighten their grip on the community. They had made judges, and they knew that the judges they made would come to them again for support. They were lawless by temperament; they felt themselves above the law. That was part of their power. They had no reverence. They had supreme confidence in themselves."

We are sorry we cannot go on quoting to show how these two men came to be as far apart as the poles in their political ideas. Suffice it so say that Johnson although not altogether successful in his ten-year fight, still gave Cleveland a franchise that limits the street car company to 6 (later 7) per cent profit for its service; and, more than that, that he "gave the city a soul," an individuality and a vision. It was here that La Follette, in his 1924 campaign, received a welcome not equaled in any other city.

The author may be pardoned if his experiences destroyed for him many an illusion, illusions about the laws, the bankers, the churches, the courts, legislative bodies, and the Constitution itself. "The makers" of the Constitution distrusted democracy and did everything possible to make the government as undemocratic as possible. They wanted people to have an appearance of power, no more."

The War continued the process of wrecking illusions. The author, like nearly everybody of Anglo-Saxon descent, believed Wilson in his arraignment of the Central Powers and his apotheosis of the Allied cause. He came to see in Paris (1919) that all the Allies were after was conquest. Not justice or truth was wanted at Paris, only spoils.

As Commissioner of Immigration, on Ellis Island, Howe did what he could to protect foreigners from the ruthless persecution of the "Red" hysteria.

Later he removed to New York, to give himself entirely to writing. His favorite subjects are on the city, city planning, city administration, etc. He had to recast his political beliefs often, but he never became a skeptic, much less a cynic. He retained his hopeful outlook. Perhaps Labor will take the reform of politics and economics in its own hands, so he says in concluding his reflections.

He had not the fighting spirit of a La Follette, he makes compromises; he is not of heroic mold. Still he has mostly taken the unpopular side in every conflict. In this book he bares the evils of the modern system understandingly and boldly. The reader will feel that he is following one who writes from experience, and with insight, not with the detachment of the theorist nor with the prejudice of a partisan. It is a story of absorbing interest and the writer a man of penerating intellect and an honest love of truth and righteousness.

The Sermon. Its Homiletical Construction by R. C. H. Lenski, Columbia, Ohio. The Lutheran Book Concern, 1927. 314 pages, $2.00.

Rev. Lenski, the editor of the "Lutherische Kirchenzeitung," and professor at Columbus Capital University (Joint Synod of Ohio), some time ago wrote a book of sermons on the new Eisenach pericopes. In the present volume he gives the results of his seminary teaching on homiletics.

Every pastor is, or ought to be, interested in sermon building. It would be difficult to find a book in which the requirements for a truly logical arrangement of the sermon in all its parts are insisted on more severely than in this one.

He takes up the text first. The text must be a unit in thought. It is well for the preacher to begin with a text instead of a subject, for if the text is first chosen, he is more likely to be faithful to his text; and the writer makes text-fidelity one of the preeminent duties of the preacher. "Scrap texts are sham texts, not real texts at all. When Lincoln was assassinated, some preacher perpetrated what he thought was a sermon on the words in John 8, 52: "Abraham is dead." The thing was not even catchy." He condemns allegorical preaching, as, for instance, when one minister preached on "loose him and let him go," and applied that to the necessity of getting rid of parental control; or preaching on the miracles of Christ and giving them an allegorical interpretation (leprosy—sin).

In choosing texts he does not favor "free" texts so much. Occasionally they may be used but if the preacher chooses them all the time, the danger is that the congregation is too much exposed to the subjective moods, needs and limitations of the preacher. Following the pericopes is better. They certainly serve to maintain a proper balance in subjects and insure a greater variety in the treatment of the Christian life. The relation between the text and the sermon ought to be very close. The endeavor should be to exhaust the text as far as that is humanly possible. It ought to be studied in the original language first, with the use of a commentary.

The division of the sermon is carefully discussed. The theme although a unity ought to contain the component parts which the division is to bring out. Analytical and synthetic divisions (the first more expository, the second more topical) are explained.

The theme is most essential, it ought to be clearly stated. So should the heads; not necessarily with first, second, and so forth. But they should be made plain, so that the hearer is guided in knowing what the preacher is speaking about.

Here we beg to differ from the writer. We followed that course for years until intelligent members in the audience found fault with it; then we did not announce them any more, but indicated them unobtrusively as we came to them. We hated to point out the "skeleton" under the flesh.

The last chapter is on elaboration, deals with the material and with the introduction and ending. There is one section on elaboration "according to psychological norms." We do not quite know what he means by this; fancy, however, that he means the sermon is to address itself to the intellect, feeling and will, primarily the will.

The professor takes his pupils into a very exacting school. He requires a very thorough study of the text; the theme must inexorably express the thought of the text, and the text absolutely fit the theme. He has no patience with loose methods or with careless thinking. The theme must be divided in true homiletical style. And so forth. All this is well justified by strict application of logical standards. Still to us it seems as though the logical requirements are stressed too much. Most preachers, we believe, would not move freely when put in such a

straight jacket. They would say the congregation is more important than the text, and if we were to follow so strictly the text requirements we might miss the main purpose of the sermon, the edification of the people.

Again, admirable as his treatment of text, division etc. is, we should have welcomed a chapter as to how to find texts. The writer certainly would not limit us to the use of the pericopes. And finding a text and a subject is one of our chief problems. Dr. Coffin in "What to preach;" writes a whole book on that (see this number, p. 468 ff)

Nevertheless, most ministers care so little about what the text requires, how a theme ought to be found and worded, and how the heads should be related to the theme, that they would do well to go to school to this strict homiletical disciplinarian. If they would submit themselves to his training as exhibited in this book, it might bring about a change in their pulpit work that would bring lasting fruit.

The book is well bound, well printed, and very reasonable in price.

Evangelisches Gemeindeleben. Lehrgang eines ländlichen Konfirmandenunterrichts von **Heinrich Seim** (Pfarrer in Hersfeld, Hessen). Göttingen. Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1927, 120 S., 4 Mk., geb. 5.20.

Dieses Handbuch für den Konfirmandenunterricht faßt besonders ländliche Verhältnisse ins Auge. Die Religion des Bauern ist nach dem Verfasser mehr Tradition und Sitte als persönliche Ueberzeugung, so daß man mit einem gewissen Recht sagen kann: Seine Religion ist seine Sitte, und umgekehrt: Seine Sitte ist seine Religion. Es wird also die Aufgabe des Geistlichen sein, bei den Kindern soviel als möglich persönliches Glaubensleben zu wecken.

Dies versucht der Verfasser nicht auf dem hergebrachten Weg durch einfache Auslegung des Katechismus zu erreichen, vielmehr, da die Konfirmation Aufnahme in die Gemeinde bedeutet, so soll die Arbeit des Pastors bei den Schülern anfangen mit **evangelischer Heimatkunde.** In anschaulicher Weise werden sie eingeführt in die Bedeutung des Gemeindelebens, der Gottesdienste, des Kirchenjahrs, der kirchlichen Handlungen, in Gesangbuch und Bibel. Dann erst folgt die **evangelische Lebenskunde.** Das Leben Jesu wird geschildert; der zweite Artikel wird besprochen vor dem ersten, etwa im Sinn des apostolischen Grußes: Die Gnade unsers Herrn Jesu Christi, die Liebe Gottes . . . Darauf folgt: dritter Artikel, die Bergpredigt und erstes Hauptstück, Vaterunser und Gebetsleben, die Gnadenmittel, Taufe, Abendmahl.

Verfasser gehört theologisch zu den Modernen. Er unternimmt, den Kindern die Schwierigkeiten aus dem Weg zu räumen, die eine wörtliche Auffassung des biblischen Berichtes oft verursacht. Bei den Wundern Jesu lehnt er ab den falschen „physikalischen" Wunderbegriff, der das Wunder darin schaut, daß es vom ordentlichen Naturverlauf abweicht und sieht es darin, daß ein Mensch **etwas an Gott erlebt.** Durch welche Mittel es geschieht, ist gleichgültig. „Das Bedeutsame dabei ist das Merkwürdige des Ereignisses, aber merkwürdig und naturgesetzwidrig, das ist etwas verschiedenes." Z. B.

der Hauptmann von Kapernaum „erlebt etwas an Jesus, er traut ihm viel zu, und das Gesundwerden des Knechtes war für ihn so merkwürdig, daß er die Heilung als die Erfüllung seiner Bitte durch Jesum **empfand.**" Er empfand sie so, aber in Wirklichkeit war es nur ein Zusammentreffen.

Wir kennen diese Wunderschau der Modernen sattsam, sie drängt sie in unhaltbare Auslegungskunststücke hinein. Kranke kommen zu Jesus in Scharen oder als einzelne und werden geheilt. Aber doch sind es keine „physikalischen" Heilungen, sie erleben etwas an Jesus, und das gibt ihnen Kraft des Glaubens und Vertrauens. Wir fragen: Matth. 9 vergibt er dem Gichtbrüchigen seine Sünden, dann heilt er ihn von seiner Lähmung, hat er nun bloß Vergebung, oder ist er auch geheilt? Aehnlich sagt der Verfasser auch bei der Auferstehung Jesu: Was da geschehen ist, kann nicht weiter erklärt werden, aber die Jünger kommen zum Glauben an den Auferstandenen. Wir fragen wieder: Ist er denn aus dem Grab erstanden, oder ist er nicht? Die Bibel mit ihrem „leeren Grab" und des Herrn Wort: „Nach drei Tagen wieder auferstehen" sind doch deutlich genug. Nach unsrer Auffassung schafft diese Art der Wundererklärung mehr Konfusion als Verständnis.

Das Lehrbuch ist voll populärer Beispiele, es hält sich meist an den Gesichtskreis der Kinder und verläßt nie die feste Fühlung mit den tatsächlichen Verhältnissen. Es ist also weniger eine Katechismuserklärung als vielmehr ein Führer in das Leben eines wirklichen Kirchengliedes.

Evangelische Missionskunde von D. **Julius Richter** (Professor der Missionswissenschaft an der Universität Berlin). Zweite erweiterte und umgearbeitete Auflage.

Band II. **Evangelische Missionslehre und Apologetik.** A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1927. 237 S., Mk. 9.50, geb. Mk. 11.50.

Den ersten Band dieser Missionskunde, von der Geschichte der Mission handelnd, haben wir seiner Zeit anerkennend besprochen. Der vorliegende zweite, von der Missionslehre und Apologetik, berührt uns nicht minder ansprechend. Der Verfasser, D. Richter, beginnt seine Missionslehre mit der biblischen Begründung. Schon die Propheten des Alten Testaments erheben sich zu der Auffassung der kosmischen Bedeutung Gottes. Jahveh ist Israels König und der Welt König. Das ganze Weltgeschehen wird als eine Entfaltung der göttlichen Heilsökonomie verstanden. Im Neuen Testament kommen diese Wurzelgedanken zur vollen Entwicklung. Harnack hat allerdings die These aufgestellt, die Mission habe nicht im Horizont Jesu gelegen. Wie aber ist es dann zu verstehen, daß die Ueberlieferung der Urgemeinde einstimmig dem auferstandenen Herrn den Missionsbefehl in den Mund gelegt hat? Oder seine Gleichnisse vom Reich Gottes, oder daß seine Jünger das Licht der **Welt,** das Salz der **Erde** sein sollen. Alle Reden Jesu haben den weltweiten Gesichtskreis auf die Menschheit. Der eigentliche Schöpfer der Heidenmission ist freilich der Apostel Paulus, dieser geniale Mann, der in sich die Gaben des rastlos Reisenden und Gründenden, des Kirchenfürsten, des Theologen und des tiefinnerlichen Mystikers verbindet. Die Ausführungen über den Apostel Paulus, sein Vorbild und seine Briefe als missionarische Sendschreiben sind höchst interessant und werfen auf den Apostel und seine Tätigkeit vielfach überraschendes Licht.

Es folgt nun die **Missionslehre.** Als Leitgedanken übernimmt er nicht den von Warneck vorgeschlagenen der **Sendung** (Begründung, Organe und Betrieb der Sendung), auch nicht den von dem Bauen des Reichs Gottes (die Reichsgottesidee ist zu viel umstritten), oder von dem Ausbau der Kirche bei den Nichtchristen, sondern er sagt: Die Aufgabe der Mission ist **das Werben für die Jüngerschaft Jesu unter den Nichtchristen** und beruft sich dabei auf das Wort Jesu: Machet zu Jüngern alle Völker! Es wäre leicht, an diesem Leitgedanken Mängel zu finden. Er ist zu individuell und gar nicht sozial und läßt das „Völker" im Worte Jesu ganz fallen. Uns würde wahrscheinlich die Idee der Ausbreitung des Reiches Gottes am genehmsten sein. Verfasser redet dann weiter von der Missionsgemeinde, -leitung, -objekt, -mittel, -betrieb und schließlich von der christlichen Gemeinde und der christlichen Kirche, wie dieselben aus den gewonnenen Jüngern Jesu organisiert werden. Im 3. (und letzten) Kapitel redet er von der Missionsapologetik. Der Begriff ist von Warneck geprägt. Verfasser setzt an Stelle desselben die „Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit den nichtchristlichen Religionen, da es sich ja nicht um eine Verteidigung (Apologetik) des Christentums handelt, sondern um einen Angriff aufs Heidentum. Er handelt erst von den primitiven Völkern, dann von den ostasiatischen Volksreligionen und endlich vom Hinduismus, dem Buddhismus und Islam.

Auch diese Partien sind höchst lehrreich. Man merkt überall die Sachkunde des Fachmannes, und seine Darlegungen zeichnen sich durch klaren Stil und anregende Schilderung aus. Das Buch ist eine Fundgrube für den Freund der Mission. Der Leser findet auf jeder Seite Belehrung und Förderung. Wir empfehlen das Werk aufs wärmste.